

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

# modern language notes

VOL. LXXVI, NO. 6, JUNE 1961

- 
- 481 A Possible Source for Spenser's Labryde. J. M. WILLIAMS
  - 484 Donne's Holy Sonnet XIV. ARTHUR L. CLEMENTS
  - 489 Milton and the Love of Angels. D. C. ALLEN
  - 491 The Latona Myth in Milton's Sonnet XII. THOMAS E. MARESCA
  - 494 *The Rape of the Lock*, II. 73-100. J. COPLEY
  - 495 Was There a Temporary Suppression of *Tom Jones* in France?  
B. P. JONES
  - 498 New Light on Sterne. L. P. CURTIS
  - 502 The Accretive Structure of Byron's "The Giaour."  
WILLIAM H. MARSHALL
  - 509 "Orion" in "The Wreck of the Deutschland." J. HILLIS MILLER
  - 515 The Order of Yeats's *Last Poems*. CURTIS BRADFORD
  - 516 Ishmael and the Problem of Formal Discontinuities in *Moby Dick*. GLAUCO CAMBON
  - 524 Robert Frost's "Directive": A Theological Reading.  
MARGARET M. BLUM
  - 525 On a Passage of Jaufre Rudel. KURT LEWENT
  - 533 Addenda to the Sources of Corneille's *L'Illusion comique*.  
A. DONALD SELLSTROM
  - 536 Grimm et les Nouvelles Littéraires de Raynal. JEANNE R. MONTY

## REVIEWS

- 540 P. AMBROS-WIDMER, *Das Personalpronomen im Bündnerromanischen in phonetischer und morphologischer Schau* (ROBERT L. POLITZER)
- 541 JAKOB BENEDIKTSSON, ed., *Sturlunga Saga Manuscript No. 122A Fol. in the Armagnac Collection* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 542 HOLGER OLOF NYGARD, *The Ballad of Heer Halewijn, Its Forms and Variations in Western Europe. A Study of the History and Nature of a Ballad Tradition* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 544 DIDRIK ARUP SEIP, *Norsk sprakhistorie til omkring 1317.2.utg.* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 545 PAUL SCHACH and LEE M. HOLLANDER, trans., *Eyrbyggja Saga* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 547 M. T. JONES-DAVIES, *Un Peintre de la vie londonienne: Thomas Dekker* (S. SCHOENBAUM)
- 551 BURTON O. KURTH, *Milton and Christian Heroism. Biblical Epic Themes and Forms in Seventeenth-Century England* (MERRITT Y. HUGHES)
- 556 WILLIAM W. APPLETON, *Charles Macklin; an actor's life* (CHARLES H. SHATTUCK)
- 562 WALTER BLAIR, *Mark Twain and Huck Finn* (EDGAR M. BRANCH)
- 564 STEPHEN CRANE, *Letters*, ed., R. W. Stallman and Lillian Gilkes (RICHARD CHASE)
- 566 LAMBERT C. PORTER, *La Fatrasie et le Fatras; essai sur la poésie irrationnelle en France au moyen âge* (GRACE FRANK)
- 568 HELMUT DE BOOR, trans., *Das Nibelungenlied* (GEORGE FENWICK JONES)
- 572 PAUL STAFF, ed., *Jean Paul and Herder. Der Briefwechsel Jean Pauls und Karoline Richters mit Herder und der Herderschen Familie in den Jahren 1785 bis 1804* (LELAND R. PHELPS)
- 575 ALBERT MEYER, *Die aesthetischen Anschauungen Otto Ludwigs* (WILLIAM H. MCCLAIN)

---

## modern language notes

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER,

*General Editor*

HENRY HORNIK,

*Managing Assistant*

DON CAMERON ALLEN  
CHARLES R. ANDERSON  
NATHAN EDELMAN  
STEFÁN EINARSSON  
JOHN FRECCERO  
RENÉ N. GIRARD  
J. LIONEL GOSSMAN  
RICHARD H. GREEN  
ANNA G. HATCHER  
HAROLD JANTZ  
WILLIAM H. MCCLAIN  
J. HILLIS MILLER  
LAWRENCE J. ROSS  
CHARLES S. SINGLETON  
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$8.00 in the United States; \$8.25 in Canada; \$8.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.25. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Second-class postage paid at Baltimore, Maryland.

# modern language notes

VOL. LXXVI, NO. 6, JUNE 1961

---

## A Possible Source for Spenser's Labryde

The range of characters found in the "natural" rustic world of Edmund Spenser's *The Faery Queen* is an almost unbroken section of the Chain of Being stretching from the beastly to the godly. At the one end is the rapist Lust, barely distinguishable from an animal, and at the other is heavenly born Belpheobe, the Diana of Faeryland's forests. Between these two extremes, in an ascending degree of reason's dominance over passion, are the Cannibals who kidnap Serena, Helenore's satyrs, Una's satyrs, the Witch's son, and Coridon. Beyond Coridon, the characters begin to transcend their baser emotions and emerge as admirable creatures. The Salvage Man, Tristram, Satyrane, Meliboe, the Hermit of Book VI, Pastorella, and Belpheobe all live according to their "natural first need,"<sup>1</sup> controlling to varying degrees their appetitive and irascible natures.

It has been noted, concerning these more admirable "natural" creatures, that Spenser almost invariably takes care to inform his reader of the noble blood which flows through their veins. He does it so consistently that it has been justifiably assumed that Spenser did not really believe that the low born were particularly disposed toward or capable of transcending their baser natures. The Salvage

<sup>1</sup> Edmund Spenser, *Works of Edmund Spenser* (London, 1924), 2-7-16.9.

Man, for example, was "borne of noble blood,"<sup>2</sup> and Spenser twice assures his readers that Tristram, despite his silver-lace-trimmed woodman's jacket, is noble born.<sup>3</sup> The Hermit who cures Serena and Timias is a "goodly person" of "gentle race."<sup>4</sup> Pastorella is discovered to be the daughter of Sir Bellamoure and Claribelle,<sup>5</sup> and Belpheobe is "borne of heavenly birth."<sup>6</sup> Only Meliboe seems to be the clear-cut exception, for he tells Calidore that he was born a shepherd lad who sought his fortune at court, only to be disillusioned with the hypocrisy and corruption he found there.<sup>7</sup> Satyrane, deliverer of Una, however, presents a problem.

He is first described as a "noble warlike knight,"<sup>8</sup> who has returned to his forest to seek his "lignage right, / From whence he took his weldeserved name."<sup>9</sup> Spenser indicates that this "weldeserved name" comes from his satyr father; his nymph mother, Thyamis; and her father, Labryde.<sup>10</sup> John Wilson opined in 1835 that Thyamis meant passion, from *θυμός*, and Labryde meant turbulent or greedy, from *λάβρος*, but then he says, "This explanation is not very satisfactory to ourselves,"<sup>11</sup> and we must agree, for it is extremely unlikely that Satyrane, rescuer of Truth, could be a direct descendant of greed and passion. Consequently, we must look elsewhere. In classical mythology, however, there is no evidence of a royal Thyamis, nor can we look to anyone named Labryde to hold up the family tree, for neither is there any mention of him.

There is, however, in Irish mythology a Gaelic god, Labraid of the Swift Hand on the Sword, "the highest of beings except the holy King of Heaven,"<sup>12</sup> who was famous for his prowess in battle and for being guardian of Magh Mell, a Gaelic Elysium.<sup>13</sup> The names are so similar that the question arises whether it were possible that Spenser instilled the blood of this Zeus of Erin in the veins of Satyrane, signaling an insistence, that will appear through the entire epic, on the necessity of noble blood before a "natural" man can transcend his animal nature.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 6-5-2.7.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 6-2-5.5, 6-2-24.6.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 6-5-36.7.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 6-12-15.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 2-3-21.9.

<sup>11</sup> John Wilson, "Legend of the Red-Cross Knight," *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxxvii (January, 1835), p. 54.

<sup>12</sup> Karl Meyer, *Über die älteste irische Dichtung*, quoted in Thomas F. O'Rahilly, *Early Irish History and Mythology* (Dublin, 1948), p. 103.

<sup>13</sup> John Rhys, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion* (London, 1888), p. 631.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 6-9-25.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 1-6-20.1.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 1-6-20.3-4.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 1-6-21, 23.



First, it is entirely probable that Spenser was familiar with the mythology concerning Labraid. The action of the stories centers around Kildare, where Labraid was supposedly born,<sup>14</sup> and where Spenser lived for a time, and around province Munster,<sup>15</sup> where Spenser lived from approximately 1586 to 1598. That Spenser shared the popular interest in Irish mythology and bardic literature is evident from his *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and such episodes in *The Faery Queen* as the stories concerning Mole and the Irish rivers. There is some indirect and rather weak evidence in his epic that Spenser was familiar with Magh Mell, Labraid's protectorate. The picture of the Genius of the Porch and the Comely Dame at the Bower of Bliss has been observed as being vaguely reminiscent of two similar figures in a prophecy concerning the Gael's pastoral Elysium.<sup>16</sup>

Through much of the epic Spenser's general knowledge of Irish history emerges. More important, he appropriates many Gaelic words and changes them to suit his own purposes, as he would have had to have done with Labraid. Artegal, for example, has been suggested as a possible combination of Arthur and Diarmuid na Gall, an Irish poet mentioned in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*.<sup>17</sup> Other examples are Ferrau and Ferraugh out of Feradach; Briana and Brianor out of Brian;<sup>18</sup> and perhaps most interesting, Brigants out of Brigantes, a tribe driven out of England by the Germanic tribes in the sixth century which settled on the Cork and Wexford coasts, some not 30 miles from Spenser's castle at Kilcolman.<sup>19</sup> One wonders about the stories Spenser must have heard about these exiles if he chose them to destroy Colin Clout's world in Book VI.

Further reason for identifying Labryde with Labraid may be found in the similar characters of Labraid and Labryde's descendant, Satyrane. Both are fearsome warriors; both are protectors of pastoral locations: and both battle against treachery and deceit. And finally, the pronunciations of the two names, Labraid and Labryde, are similar enough to indicate that one is perhaps the source of the other. Both are disyllabic and accented on the second syllable. Spenser rhymed Labryde with "tyde," but how he would have pronounced the second syllable of Labraid is and probably will forever remain doubtful. When he first heard it, in what dialect, and with what accent would

<sup>14</sup> O'Rahilly, p. 103.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 108.

<sup>16</sup> Pauline Henley, *Spenser in Ireland* (London, 1928), p. 117.

<sup>17</sup> Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, p. 659.

<sup>18</sup> Henley, pp. 126-127.

<sup>19</sup> O'Rahilly, pp. 34-37.

have to be considered. But even if Spenser had pronounced the second syllable of the two names differently, as he undoubtedly did, the difference would hardly be great enough to cast serious doubts about the striking similarity of the names.

So it seems that when Spenser mentioned Satyrane's "lignage right, / From when he took his weldeserved name," he had in mind the blood of the Gaelic god, Labraid of the Swift Hand on the Sword, blood that would give Satyrane his noble lineage and allow this "natural" knight to rise out of the satyr world and into a world of quests and potential glory.

University of Wisconsin

J. M. WILLIAMS

## Donne's Holy Sonnet XIV

Several critics have commented that the three persons of the "three-person'd God" in Donne's *Holy Sonnet XIV*, "Batter my heart," are to operate separately: God the Father is to break instead of merely knocking; God the Holy Ghost is to blow instead of merely breathing; and God the Son (Sun) is to burn instead of merely shining.<sup>1</sup> Certainly *three-person'd God* of the first line occasions such an expectation, and it seems both natural and inevitable that Donne should draw upon the traditional emphasis of the symbolism of the Three Persons—the Father as Power, the Son as Light, and the Holy Ghost as Breath. Correct in so far as it goes, this view of the poem tends, however, to overlook certain rich biblical values and associations of *knocke*, *breathe*, *shine*, associations of which Donne would not have been ignorant. (The very order of *knocke*, *breathe*, *shine* and of Donne's translation of these to the violent *breake*, *blowe*, *burn* suggests the inaccuracy of exclusively assigning each word respectively to the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the Son: to reflect the traditional order of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Donne could instead have written "knocke, shine, breathe" and "breake, burn, blowe.") A brief examination of several biblical uses of *knocke*, *breathe*, *shine* should indicate, at least for the purposes of the poem, that each of the other Persons

<sup>1</sup> Doniphan Louthan, *The Poetry of John Donne* (New York, 1951), p. 124; George Herman, "Donne's Holy Sonnets, XIV," *Explicator*, XII (December 1953), Item 18; George Knox, "Donne's Holy Sonnets, XIV," *Explicator*, XV (October 1956), Item 2.

is "involved" in the activity of any one; in other words, the paradox of three-in-one is truly and profoundly a paradox and is operative as such in the poem.

Traditionally the courting of man by God, the knocking at his heart, is associated with Christ, not the Father. The bridegroom of the Song of Solomon is usually taken to symbolize Christ; the heart of man is the Bridegroom's, the Saviour's Chamber, but the heart is hardened with sin, and the Bridegroom, standing outside, must knock to gain entrance. "I sleep, but my heart waketh: it is the voice of my beloved that knocketh, saying, Open to me . . ." (Song of Solomon 5:2). In the New Testament, Revelation 3:20 follows this tradition: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me."<sup>2</sup> Christ's knocking is, I think, definitely germane to the poem's theme of love and courtship, even though this theme has been characteristically transformed by Donne to a violent love and courtship. With his translation of *knocke* to *breake*, Donne is not only calling on the power of the Father but he is also imploring Christ to court him not in Christ's usual role and manner of mild Lamb but rather as battering, overpowering Ram.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, since Donne is seeking God's courtship and love—"Yet dearly I love you, and would be loved faine"—and since, traditionally, the Holy Ghost infuses love into the hearts of men—" . . . the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost" (Romans 5:5)—there seems to be no necessity for reading the poem as excluding the Comforter from the activity of courting or knocking.

*Breathe* is traditionally associated with the Holy Ghost's infusion of grace into the heart of man, yet is also linked, biblically, inevitably, with activities of both the Father and the Son. From Genesis on, the Father is referred to as the giver of life to man by breathing into his nostrils the breath of life.<sup>4</sup> This is at least relevant to the sonnet since Donne is asking for new, innocent life, as was given Adam before the Fall: "make me new." After His resurrection Christ appeared to his disciples, and "he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22). Grace may be infused into man's

<sup>2</sup> See also Luke 12:36 and John 14:23.

<sup>3</sup> The Lamb-Ram contrast is of course only implicit in this sonnet; but cf. the seventh of the *La Corona* sonnets, ll. 9-10:

O strong Ramme, which hast batter'd heaven for mee,  
Mild Lambe, which with thy blood, hast mark'd the path.

<sup>4</sup> Genesis 2:7; see also, e.g., Job 33:4, Isaiah 30:33, 42:5, Acts 17:24-25.

heart not by the activity of the Third Person alone but by the activity of the Son as well. The possible objection that New Testament theology took the breath of life to be the Spirit of God, that is, the Holy Spirit or Ghost, and that *breathed* in the verse just quoted is a signal of the Third Person merely emphasizes, in effect, the ultimate identity of the Three Persons and thus their actually united trinitarian actions in the poem, for, as St. John of the Cross says, "the Holy Spirit, Who is love, is also compared to air in the Divine Scripture, since he is the breath of the Father and the Son."<sup>5</sup>

There can be no disputing about the relation between the Son and *shine*. In "A Hymne to God the Father," Donne writes "Sweare by thy selfe, that at my death thy Sunne Shall shine as it shines now . . ."; the Son-sun pun is familiar enough. And the many biblical references to Christ as the Light or the bringer of light, most notably in John, need no quoting. But, in some ways, the First and Third Persons are also associated with light and shining. The Father is, to begin with, the creator of light, and many verses link light and the word *shine* with God the Father or with just God without distinction made as to person: 2 Corinthians 4:6, for example, reads, "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness [this is clearly God the Father] hath shined in our hearts."<sup>6</sup> Especially because the poem refers to "Reason your viceroy in mee," the activity and efficacy of the Third Person, who shines upon and rectifies the weak and unfaithful reason or understanding, may also be designated, though perhaps less obviously than the Father and Son, by the word *shine*. The Holy Ghost, who is truth, descended in "tongues like as of fire" upon the apostles, enabling them to shed the light, the word of God, abroad in many tongues; as Christ promised, "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost . . . shall teach you all things . . . will guide you into all truth."<sup>7</sup> When Christ absents himself to go to the Father, the Holy Ghost will bring the truth or light to men, that is, will shine in their hearts. There seems, then, to be no justification in the sonnet, and no need, for ignoring the association of the First and Third Persons with light and *shine*.

May we not grant that Donne is exploiting both the traditional

<sup>5</sup> *Complete Works*, trans. and ed. E. A. Peers (London, 1953), II, 70; for this quotation I am indebted to R. A. Durr.

<sup>6</sup> See also 2 Samuel 22:29, Numbers 6:25, Job 41:32, Psalms 18:28, 31:16, 36:9, 67:1, 80:3, 80:19, 84:11, 119:135, James 1:17.

<sup>7</sup> John 14:26, 16:13. See also John 14:16-17, 15:26, 16:7-12, Acts 2:2-11, 19:2-6, 1 John 5:6.

distinctions among the Three Persons (Father-Power, Son-Light, Holy Ghost-Breath) and also the traditional biblical values and associations of *knocke, breathe, shine*? His undoubted familiarity with all these biblical passages would not, I think, have permitted the oversimplifying division of powers along the lines suggested by the critics, a division which tends to rationalize and diminish the paradox of the Trinity. Profound paradox and the consequent greater complexity of the poem are characteristic of Donne, who in this sonnet is asking *three person'd God* to break (not just the Father alone), to blow (not just the Holy Ghost alone), to burn (not just the Son alone) and make him new. It is as if all the triple strength of the Three Persons acting as one, with true trinitarian force, is required to raise Donne from his deeply sinful life and hence to effect his salvation.

A consequence of recognizing the full implications of *knocke, breathe, shine* is that the sonnet's structure cannot then be viewed as the development of three quatrains each separately assigned primarily to each of the Three Persons.<sup>8</sup> Rather, I believe the organizing principle of the poem is, with Donne's qualification of it, the paradox of death and rebirth, the central paradox of Christianity: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal" (John 12: 24-25). To enter the kingdom of God man must die and be born again. Donne knows he must give up his unregenerate sinful life, but he feels his heart and will are so black and obdurate, his sense of sin so great, that (the thought is almost blasphemous) the "ordinary" means of God's mercy and grace, His knocking, breathing, shining, will not suffice. God must forcefully overpower and overwhelm him, must batter and overthrow him in order that he may rise reborn.<sup>9</sup> To the familiar biblical paradox Donne has added his own peculiar meaning; it is in his characteristic manner that Donne insists on the necessity of God's forceful overpowering.

<sup>8</sup> See, esp. Knox: "The triadic division of the sonnet into quatrains follows the extension of the 'knock, breathe, shine,' and the 'break, blow, burn,' alignments. The first quatrain calls on God the Father's omnipotence to batter the heart. The second envisions the admission of God through the medium or agency of Rectified Reason, Reason rectified through love. The third exemplifies the reborn understanding (*enlightened through the Son*) . . ."

<sup>9</sup> Cf. l. 3 of this sonnet, "That I may rise, and stand, o'erthrow mee . . ." with the last line of "Hymne to God, my God, in my Sicknesse": "Therefore that he may raise, the Lord throws down."



This paradox of dividing in order to unite, destroying in order to revive, throwing down in order to raise, determines the choice of and finds expression in the poem's figurative language, which is of two kinds: one kind is warlike, military, destructive, dividing; the other is marital, sexual, or uniting. Each kind of figurative language operates *throughout* the sonnet, in the first two quatrains and in the sestet. Looking at words and phrases, we can recognize the military and destructive kind in *Batter, o'erthrow, bend your force, breake, blowe, burn* of the first quatrain; most obviously in the besieged, usurped town imagery of the second quatrain; and in *enemie, divorce, untie, breake, imprison, enthrall, and ravish* of the sestet. The marital, regenerating or uniting kind can be observed in *heart, knocke, breathe, shine, rise, stand, make me new* of the first quatrain; *untrue* in the second quatrain; all of line 9, *betroth'd, divorce, Take mee to you, enthrall, chast, ravish* in the sestet. The first quatrain, as we have seen, using traditional biblical terms and Donne's translation of these into new and violent metaphors, calls on the triune God to destroy the sinful old man and remake, regenerate him.<sup>10</sup> The terms *Batter, o'erthrow, bend your force* and *breake, blowe, burn* prepare for and serve as a transition to the besieged, usurped town imagery of the second quatrain, if they do not actually participate in that metaphor. Through the development of military metaphors, the heart is compared to a town wrongfully appropriated and helplessly possessed by God's "enemie." Briefly, in the second quatrain, Donne *implies* what the first quatrain states, that God must act for him, must batter down and overthrow his sinful heart in order to raise it purified since his reason is captive and he cannot help himself.

The word *untrue* (in the sense of "unfaithful" it is a marital kind of metaphor) serves as a transition to the sestet, which develops overtly on the level of violence and rape the theme of love and courtship implicit in lines 1 and 2, particularly in *heart* and *knocke*. The heart is now metaphorically construed as a woman. In lines 9 and 10, Donne says explicitly that his sinful heart still loves and would be loved by God but is willfully bound to satanic powers. *Enemie*,

<sup>10</sup> Perhaps also in the first quatrain, on a secondary level, the heart is being compared metaphorically to an alchemical object; note esp. l. 4 and cf. "Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward," ll. 40-41: "Burne off my rusts, and my deformity, Restore thine Image . . ." Or perhaps (see J. C. Levenson, "Donne's Holy Sonnets, XIV," *Explicator*, xi [March 1953], Item 31 and xii [April 1954], Item 36) the conceit is that of the heart as a metal object in God's, the metal-worker's hands.

at the end of line 10, is a return to military metaphor and provides the transition to the rough and irresistible love of lines 11 and 12, exceptionally heavy-stressed lines, and of lines 13 and 14, the paradoxical, explanatory couplet. Again, Donne impies, so great is his sense of sin and helplessness, that God must forcefully sever his sinful bonds, must release him from the prison of sin to bind and imprison him in the triune personality of God and thereby, paradoxically, free him. He will never be essentially free unless God enthralls him and never chaste, that is pure, innocent, whole, holy, unless God ravishes him.

Throughout the sonnet there has been this paradox of destroying in order to make whole, of throwing down in order to raise, expressed by the two basic kinds of figurative language. Significantly, the words *divorce*, *enthrall*, *ravish* in lines 11, 13, 14 partake of both kinds of metaphor: a divorce is a dividing, yet the word is associated with marriage; to enthrall is both to subjugate and to captivate or enamor; ravishing is both sexual and violent. In lines 11 to 14, then, the organizing paradox, having been argued throughout the poem in Donne's characteristic intellectual mode, even though the poem is highly emotional and personal, is enhanced and compounded in force not just by a juxtaposition but now by a fusing or uniting of the two kinds of metaphor; it is as if the metaphors are made to achieve between themselves what Donne wishes to achieve with God.

Syracuse University

ARTHUR L. CLEMENTS

## Milton and the Love of Angels

In *Paradise Lost*, VIII, 620-9, Raphael at Adam's behest describes the union of loving spirits who blend together, lacking the bars of limb, as "Air with Air," and, hence, need no "restrain'd conveyance" "As Flesh to mix with Flesh, or Soul with Soul." To some degree, we have been prepared for this answer by a passage in Book One.

For Spirits when they please  
Can either Sex assume, or both; so soft  
And uncompounded is thir Essence pure,  
Not ti'd nor manac'd with joint or limb,  
Nor founded on the brittle strength of bones,

Like cumbrous flesh; but in what shape they choose  
Dilated or condens't, bright or obscure,  
Can execute their aery purposes,  
And works of love or enmity fulfil (423-31).

This annotation, which halts for a moment the procession of idols, could be held for contextual reasons to refer to evil spirits only, but there is naught in the lines themselves that commands a limited reading. It is, I think, more likely Milton's anatomy of spirits good, middle, and bad.

The speech of Raphael was explained by Marilla<sup>1</sup> in terms of the Renaissance concept of the ideal union of lovers as exemplified by Donne in "The Extasie." In this opinion, Marilla is completely right, but no supporting text on the angelic level has been discovered; and West, who has winnowed the literature of angelology and considered this very problem at some length, can find only a timid hint of the idea in More's *The Immortality of the Soul*.<sup>2</sup> Support for Marilla's position is to be found in Alessandro Piccolomini's *Della Institutione Morale*, a practical work on ethics issued first in 1542 and reprinted many times.

Piccolomini has been talking about the desire of the lover for union with the beloved:

Hora, qual debba essere questa perfetta unione, non e difficil cosa à vedere, perciocche in altro non consiste, che in una trasmutation di due animi in un solo; quasi che due sieno i corpi, & uno lo spirito: poscia che gli animi, per non haver, quanto à se, quantità, si potrebbero per quanto à lor tocca, commodamente congiugnere, & penetrare, & perfettissimamente unire, dove i corpi, per le loro quantità, & dimensioni, non è cosa possibile, che così congiuntamente s'uniscano, che due non rimangano. I corpi adunque son quelli che non solamente per la loro imperfettione non si possono unire; ma ancora impediscono, che gli animi non si congiungano à modo loro & à voglia loro. Laqual difficoltà tra gli spiriti celesti non adiviene: liquali, non essendo impediti da' corpi, con perfettissimo congiugnimento s'uniscono; come ben dimostra Dante ne gli ultimi canti del Paradiso.<sup>3</sup>

The Johns Hopkins University

D. C. ALLEN

<sup>1</sup> "Milton on Conjugal Love among the Heavenly Angels," *MLN*, LXVIII (1953), 485-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Milton and the Angels* (Athens, Ga., 1955), p. 172.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. (Venice, 1575), 433-4. The reference is probably to *Paradiso*, xxviii.

## The Latona Myth in Milton's Sonnet XII

In the second of two sonnets protesting the reception given his *Tetrachordon*, Milton employs an episode from the myth of Latona which allows him to liken his detractors to the rustics who denied drink to the weary goddess. The passage reads as follows:

I did but prompt the age to quit their clogs  
By the known rules of ancient liberty,  
When straight a barbarous noise environs me  
Of Owls, and Cuckoos, Asses, Apes and Dogs.  
As when those Hinds that were transform'd to Frogs  
Rail'd at *Latona's* twin-born progeny  
Which after held the Sun and Moon in fee.  
But this is got by casting Pearls to Hogs . . . (1-8).

The myth serves the obvious function of denigrating Milton's critics; still, half the metaphor is unexplained. What are we to make of the juxtaposition of Milton and Latona, whose progeny so ostensibly "after held the Sun and Moon in fee?"

The most important source of this myth is Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Book VI, 330-380), wherein are described Niobe's blasphemy against Latona and consequent punishment by Diana and Apollo, and the episode referred to by Milton, which recalls Latona's flight from Juno's wrath, her refuge on Delos, the birth of Diana and Apollo, and the punishment of the rustics. All of these enjoyed a long tradition of commentary, both euhemeristic and moral.

Several explanations of Latona were available to Milton, all of them of impressive age and authority. The oldest of them may be traced to Plato:

Λητώ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς πρᾶτης τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ἐθελήματα εἶναι ὧν ἂν τις δέηται. Ἰσως δὲ ὡς οἱ ξένοι καλοῦσιν· πολλοὶ γὰρ Ληθῶ καλοῦσιν· ἔοικεν οὖν πρὸς τὸ μὴ τραχὺ τοῦ ἥθους, ἀλλ' ἡμερόν τε καὶ λείον Λειηθῶ κεκληῆσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦτο καλούντων.<sup>1</sup>

This etymological explanation is repeated by the Renaissance commentator Natale Conti, who also offers another alternative: Latona is derived from *λανθάνω*, "to forget or conceal," and she represents "iniurarium oblivionem."<sup>2</sup> This explanation appears again in the later mythographic work, *Pantheum Mythicum*, as well as in Sandys' *Ovid*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plato, *Cratylus*, ed. Martin Schanz (Leipzig, 1877), pp. 36-7.

<sup>2</sup> Natale Conti, *Mythologiae* (Patavii, 1616), p. 142.

<sup>3</sup> Francisco Pomey, *Pantheum Mythicum* (Frankfort, 1713), p. 34; George Sandys, *Ovid's Metamorphosis Englished* (London, 1640), pp. 116-7.

In accord with his understanding of Latona as "forgetfulness of injuries," Conti interprets Apollo as emblematic of the power of music, and Diana as the personification of femininity:

Fuerunt qui Latonam matrem fuisse Apollonis tradiderint, quia suavis Musicae Harmoniae malorum omnium oblivionem inducat, quae sunt in hac miserrima et molestiarum plenissima hominum vita. Dicunt Dianam filiam fuisse eiusdem Latonae, quia Musica modo ad lenitatem muliebrem animos mortalium inflectat, modo ad fortitudinem erigat et inflammet, strenuosque faciat.<sup>4</sup>

He adds further, that this forgetting of injuries, when coupled with the hope of heaven, frees the soul from human misfortune:

Haec malorum oblivio cum plena sit spe et pulchritudine de coelo adveniente, ab humanis calamitatibus tanquam a serpente, terrore afficitur: verum tamen ope divina ad partum adiuvatur, ac serpentem denique superat.<sup>5</sup>

This sort of interpretation of the Latona myth lends itself perfectly to application in Milton's sonnet, and leaves him, through the comparison to Latona, in the guise of a long-suffering Christian awaiting his heavenly reward. There was, however, an alternative interpretation available to Milton which seems to fit better the facts of the poem and—perhaps—his own temperament.

In Bersuire's commentary on the *Metamorphoses*, Latona is glossed as representing "faith or the Scripture, which from the beginning were pregnant with Phoebus and Diana, that is, with Christ and the Blessed Virgin." The rustics who antagonized her are described as rude, vile, and impatient persons who were justly and suitably punished by God.<sup>6</sup>

Similar interpretations are found in the Old French *Ovide Moralisé*. Phoebus, son of Latona and slayer of Python, is Christ:

Mes Phebus, dieus de sapience,  
Solaus et lumiere du monde,  
C'est Christus, ou tous bien habonde,  
Au dyable se combati  
Pour home. . . .<sup>7</sup>

Later in the poem he is glossed again as Christ, the Good Shepherd.<sup>8</sup> Diana is another representation of God:

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., p. 507.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 507.

<sup>6</sup> Bersuire, *Metamorphoseos Moralizatae*, lib. VI, fa. xiii Q, et seq.

<sup>7</sup> *Ovide Moralisé*, ed. C. de Boer, printed in *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde*, vol. xiv; Book I,

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., Book II, lines 3583-99.



Dyane, c'est la Deite  
Qui regnoit en la Trinite. . . .<sup>9</sup>

As brother and sister, they are considered emblematic of wisdom, charity, and virginity, which should always accompany each other.<sup>10</sup>

Alexander Ross is witness to the active survival of this tradition into the Seventeenth Century; indeed, his interpretations of Apollo and Diana carry even further the intimations of the Medieval commentators:

Our saviour Christ is the true *Apollo*, both a destroyer of Satans Kingdomes, and a saver of his people; for *ἀποδύειν*, is as much as to lose by paying the price of Redemption; he is the Son of God, and the God of Wisdom, the great Prophet, the Son of *Latona*, that is, of an obscure maid: the true God of Physick who cureth all our infirmities; and the God of Musick too for that harmony of affections and Communion of Saints in the Church is from him; he hath subdued our Giants, that is, our spirituall foes, by whose malice the thunder of Gods wrath was kindled against us; he is immortall, and *the good Shepheard who hath laid down his life for his sheepe*, having for his sheepes sake forsaken his Fathers glory; and he it is who hath built the walls of *Jerusalem*; *Apollo* was never so much in love with *Hiacinthus*, as Christ was with the sonnes of men.<sup>11</sup>

Of Diana, Ross has also a great deal to say:

Gods Church is the true *Diana*, the daughter of God, the sister of the son of righteousness, who is a virgin in purity, and yet a fruitfull mother of spiritual children, whose conversation is sequestered from the world: she is supported in the silver chariot of Gods word, in which she is carried towards heaven, being drawn with the white staggs of innocency and feare; shee holdeth in her hands Lions and Leopards, the Kings of the Gentils who have suffered themselves to be caught and tamed by her: she flieth with the wings of faith and devotion: and hunts after beasts, that is, wicked men to catch them in her nets, that she may save their souls, and with her arrows kill their sins. *Diana* was midwife, to bring forth *Apollo*, so the Church travells in birth, till Christ be formed in us, and brought forth in our holy lives: and as it fared with *Dianas Temple*, which was burned by *Erostratus*, so it doth with the Church, whose Temples have been robbed, defaced, and ruined by prophane men.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, in likening himself to *Latona*, Milton is defending the truth of the *Tetrachordon*, his progeny, for which *Apollo* and *Diana*—Christ and his Church—have become the metaphors. That this is the conception of *Latona* and her offspring with which Milton is working

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., Book III, lines 635-36.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., Book I, lines 3122-32.

<sup>11</sup> Alexander Ross, *Mystogogus Poeticus* (London, 1653), pp. 28-9.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., pp. 99-100.

is borne out by the Scriptural passage referred to in line 8 of the sonnet:

But this is got by casting Pearls to Hogs. . . .

The Biblical passage is Matthew 7:6—"Do not give to dogs what is holy, neither cast your pearls before swine, or they will trample them under their feet and turn and tear you."

These metaphoric pearls had long been glossed as "the mysteries of the gospel," and the swine as "prophane men, who despise and care nothing about these things (the gosptl)."<sup>13</sup> They are those who show their contempt of Christ's teachings by the impurity of their lives.<sup>14</sup>

Thus, in the first eight lines of the sonnet, Milton has manipulated a Classical and a Scriptural image to the same end: the detractors of his *Tetrachordon* have become both the crude rustics who affronted Latona, and the swine who reject the gospel. From the comments gathered above it must be abundantly clear that—for the purposes of this sonnet—the *Tetrachordon*, the progeny of Latona, and "the mysteries of the gospel" are identical.

The Johns Hopkins University

THOMAS E. MARESCA

## *The Rape of the Lock*, II. 73-100

It is generally far easier to remember a Pope couplet than to place it exactly in its context. The poet, attracted by what he has just written, is always retracing his words: ideas, images he has used are carefully remembered, and they tend to re-appear in ever-changing patterns. This sort of retrospective composition is strikingly illustrated in Ariel's description of the various occupations of the sylphs in *The Rape of the Lock*, 2. 73-100.

Pope's preoccupation in this poem, of course, is with the continual scaling-down of the heroic. Even the duties of the sylphs are arranged in diminishing order of importance, from those who "in the Fields of purest Æther play," (77) to the "less refined," who "on Earth o'er human Race preside," (87) down to the sylphs whose "humbler Province is to tend the Fair." (91) When Pope descends to give

<sup>13</sup> Samuel Bochart, *Hieroicoicon* (Leipzig, 1793), Book I, p. 813.

<sup>14</sup> Hugo Grotius, *Operum Theologicorum Tomus Secundus* (Basileae, 1732), p. 89.

details of this "humbler Province," the process of diminution goes hand in hand with verbal echoes of his list of the duties of the higher sylph. Whilst some of the higher sylphs "brew fierce Tempests on the wintry Main," (85) the balance is redressed by the miniature counter-attack of those sylphs who "save the Powder from too rude a Gale." (93) The higher sylphs "suck the Mists in grosser Air below," (83) and they are parried by those who do not "let th'imprison'd Essences exhale." (94) The higher sylphs "dip their Pinions in the painted Bow," (84) but the lower kind "steal from Rainbows." (96) Notice how lines 96 and 97,

To steal from Rainbows ere they drop in Show'rs  
A brighter Wash . . .

recall "the kindly Rain" of line 86. And the verb "distill" of that line is echoed by "th'imprison'd Essences" in line 94.

With such repetitions and echoes is the reader carried along by the poet, this movement tending to take the place of a more strictly logical development. "Watch all their Ways, and all their Actions guide" (88) is particularised—and at the same time reduced—to "Assist their Blushes, and inspire their Airs." (98)

Fourah Bay College,  
Freetown, Sierra Leone

J. COPLEY

## Was There a Temporary Suppression of *Tom Jones* in France?

Mr. E. P. Shaw has recently referred in these pages<sup>1</sup> to the *Arrêt du Conseil* of the 24th February, 1750, purporting to suppress the *Histoire de Tom Jones*, and has thus raised anew an interesting if minor question of literary history, first brought to light by M. Digeon some years ago.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Shaw may however have done the French authorities less than justice by his claim that "a foreign masterpiece was thus at least temporarily suppressed merely to punish a book-

<sup>1</sup> "A Note on the temporary Suppression of 'Tom Jones' in France," *MLN*, LXXII (1957), 41.

<sup>2</sup> "La condamnation de Tom Jones à Paris," *Revue anglo-américaine*, VI (1927), 529-31.

seller," since doubts may be cast on the completeness and even on the existence of this suppression.

The translation was published, anonymously and with a false place of publication, in the first half of February, 1750. The police seem to have moved rapidly, as the *Arrêt* was signed only about a fortnight later, but their work may well have borne no further fruit. The appearance of the French version of the novel was immediately greeted by a considerable number of largely favourable reviews, dated from the 20th February to mid-March. None mentions the *Arrêt*, and the presumption that it had not yet been published is strengthened by a laudatory article in the semi-official and therefore cautious *Mercure*.<sup>3</sup>

The first and only public French reference to the *Arrêt* in fact appears to have occurred in an otherwise unknown *Gazette à la main* dated the 16th March, gleefully quoted by *Old England* as follows: "An arrêt of the Council of State is issued for suppressing a certain immoral work, entitled *The History of Tom Jones*, translated from the English."<sup>4</sup> Now the *Arrêt*, as M. Digeon has pointed out,<sup>5</sup> does not mention or imply immorality as the reason for condemnation, so that the *Gazette* may have known of its existence only from rumour. This is the more probable as the decree, though duly inscribed in the "registres de la Communauté des Libraires et Imprimeurs de Paris," seems never to have been brought to the notice of the public in any of the usual papers—not, for example, in the *Mercure*, the *Petites Affiches* or the *Gazette de France*. The obvious disgust of the Marquis d'Argenson,<sup>6</sup> a signatory of the *Arrêt*, but an admirer of Fielding, suggests a probable reason for this. This unusual lack of publicity is significant, as a large number of copies of the novel had been sold before March, and could hardly be returned to the "greffe de la police" unless the existence and terms of the *Arrêt* were generally known.

It is true that French reviewers of *Tom Jones* fall silent after March, and that the second edition of La Place's translation, still

<sup>3</sup> *Mercure* (mars 1750), 175-179.

<sup>4</sup> *Old England*, 7th April, 1750. See also *The Gentleman's Magazine*, xx (March 1750), 118 n; and *The Monthly Review* (March 1750). Cf. Blanchard, *Fielding the Novelist* (1926), pp. 45-47.

<sup>5</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Marquis d'Argenson, *Journal et Mémoires* (Paris, 1864), iv, 182. D'Argenson finds "rien que de vertueux dans ce petit roman anglais," and there is nothing to justify the *Arrêt*, "mais l'ouvrier a manqué d'attention à M. Maboul, maître des requêtes, chargé par M. le Chancelier du district de la librairie, et Maboul est bien un autre ouvrier" (28 mars 1750).

anonymous, is published in April at Amsterdam, reviewed only by the *Bibliothèque impartiale* of Leyden;<sup>7</sup> but neither of these facts necessarily implies the actual publication of the *Arrêt*, which alone would have affected readers of the novel. The appearance and ready sale of a second edition two months after the first may signify either the suppression or the rapid exhaustion of the first edition, but the contemporary enthusiasm and the number of copies of the original version even now available in European libraries strongly suggest the second explanation. In any event, d'Argenson assures us<sup>8</sup> that "Tout le monde lit aujourd'hui ce livre à Paris, comme on faisait de *Gulliver* et de *Paméla* dans leur temps"; Prince Charles Edward, resident in France, has no qualms in writing to Mlle Ferrand in Paris for a French copy of the novel on the 18th May, 1750;<sup>9</sup> in October or November, the first edition of *Joseph Andrews* published in France since 1744 testifies to the success of *Tom Jones*;<sup>10</sup> and in January, 1751, the publication by Rollin of a signed third edition in Paris<sup>11</sup> clearly shows the period of "suppression" to be over.<sup>12</sup>

The question of whether the *Arrêt* was in fact ever implemented or known to the public is lent a certain piquancy by the reluctant reply of Defoeval to a gloating enquiry from Richardson on this very subject: "I am sorry to say it, but you do my countrymen more honour than they truly deserve, in surmising that they had virtue enough to refuse a licence to *Tom Jones*: I think it a profligate performance upon your pronouncing it such, for I have not read the piece, though much extolled; but it has had a vast run here this great while, . . ."<sup>13</sup>

It must, I think, be admitted that if this *Arrêt* was in fact ever made public, the mountain gave birth to a remarkably small mouse. It was certainly not made public before mid-March, 1750; it was

<sup>7</sup> *Bibliothèque impartiale*, 1 (mai-juin 1750), 434-39.

<sup>8</sup> Marquis d'Argenson, *Journal et Mémoires* (Paris, 1857-58), v, 111-112.

<sup>9</sup> See Andrew Lang, *Pickle the Spy* (London, 1897), pp. 96-97, and Prince Charles Edward (London, 1900), p. 240.

<sup>10</sup> *Mercur* (novembre 1750), 443.

<sup>11</sup> Reviewed by Fréron in February (*Lettres sur quelques écrits de ce tems*, V. 3-22) without reference to any previous difficulties.

<sup>12</sup> Though the *Arrêt*, which was never officially rescinded, had hopefully decreed that the book "sera et demeurera" suppressed, and had "fait défense (à Rollin) de récidiver" on pain of "Clôture de boutique, déchéance de maîtrise, même de punition corporelle. . . ." If Rollin could now so blatantly ignore the decree, he is unlikely to have been unduly troubled by it earlier.

<sup>13</sup> Barbauld, *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson* (London, 1804), v, 276-277. Quoted by Blanchard and M. Digeon (loc. cit.). It is perhaps noteworthy that the *Arrêt*, ignored in France, is seized on joyfully by Fielding's enemies in England.



certainly a dead letter before January, 1751. During the nine months at most in which it may have been operative, it was only once referred to publicly in France, and then quite inaccurately; it certainly does not appear to have held up the sale of two large editions of the novel, or in any way to have affected its reputation in France; and four months later Defreval, a Frenchman who had every reason to refer to it, is forced to confess ignorance of its very existence.

We know that the purpose of the *Arrêt* was not to suppress a dangerous or harmful book, but to teach the publisher a greater respect for authority in the person of Maboul.<sup>14</sup> It seems reasonable, therefore, to assume that the authorities achieved their object by the simple threat of the *Arrêt*, without publication or implementation, and that the confiscation clause, at least, was never intended to become operative in practice. The Ancien Régime was by no means over-rigid in such cases, especially when men in the position of d'Argenson were in favour of leniency.<sup>15</sup> After a period of suspense, perhaps, a humble apology from Damocles-Rollin to Maboul—accompanied by payment of the fine of 500 livres?—no doubt brought an unofficial intimation that the matter might be considered closed.

*The University of Leeds*

B. P. JONES

## New Light on Sterne

In 1957 Bodley's Librarian acquired fragments of an eighteenth-century parson's correspondence. They consist of Sterne's earliest known letter and five letters written by the Rev. Dr. Thomas Newton, who was elevated to the see of Bristol in 1761. Newton's letters contain his impressions of both the new king, George III, a youth of twenty-two, and of Sterne in the first and also the afflicting second flush of his fame as the author of *Tristram Shandy*. All six letters were written to the Rev. John Dealtary.

John Dealtary was some five years older than Sterne. Like him, Dealtary had been admitted sizar at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he received the B. A. degree in 1730/1. He was ordained priest in 1733 and succeeded his father in the rectory of Skirpenbeck, near

<sup>14</sup> See note (6).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Belin, *Le Commerce des livres prohibés à Paris (1750-1789)* (Paris, 1913).

Pocklington, Yorks., three years later. In 1739 he received the following letter from Sterne, who, the year before, had been collated to the vicarage of Sutton on the Forest. The two friends were then living near York.

Young as he was (Sterne would be twenty-six four days after the docketed date of his letter), he already foreshadowed the mercurial and love-lorn Yorick of his maturity. He wrote from Skelton Castle, near Saltburn, Yorks., the seat of his intimate of the days at Jesus, John Hall, at whose marriage to Anne Stevenson he would officiate early the next year. The two young men, it may be assumed, had been enjoying themselves at Durham and Skelton. But Sterne was actually down in the dumps. He was much dejected by a frustrating love-affair — at a time when he was supposedly courting his future wife, Elizabeth Lumley. In his letter Sterne also showed himself to be a born scribbler. He solicited correspondence. The 'great many letters' he had to answer 'this Post,' together with the replies, may well have been among 'the large piles of Letters in the Garrets at York' or in his bureau at Coxwold, which in the event of his death he advised his wife, in 1761, to search through for strokes of wit or humor — with an eye, of course, to publication and income.

docketed: Rev. Laurence Sterne Nov: 20. 1739

For The Revd. Mr. Dealtry Rectr. of Skirtinbeck to  
be left at Mr. Burlys in the Pavement, York, ———

Dear Dealtry

Tho' I hate makeing excuses, yet I cannot help explaining this seeming peice of Inconsistence in my acting; I mean of first Solliciting a Correspondence with you, and afterwards runing the risque of entirely breaking it of, by a Silence for some time; which may naturally enough be Interpreted as a good natured way of telling a Correspondent, one is weary of an Intercourse; I should wrong both you and myself If I sufferd you to Imagine this was the Case, since out of all my friends, there is none whose letters give me so much pleasure both in the receipt and perusal; I have been these three weeks at Durram with Mr. Hall on a visit, and am but Just returnd to Skelton where I met with yr Letter with thirteen more which the family had neglected to farther to Durram: I never wishd for your Company so much in my life as Just now. I have a thousand things I want to talk over with you, which are only fit for Conversation, & cannot well be committed to paper: I must let you know thus much; That you have now received a Letter from one of the most miserable and Discontented Creatures upon Earth; Since I writ last to you, I have drawn Miss C—— into a Correspondence: in the Course of which together with her Consistency in acting towards me, since the begining of this affair; I am convinced she is fixed in a resolution never to marry, and

as the whole summ of happiness I ever proposed was staked upon that single Point, I see nothing left for me at present but a dreadfull Scene of uneasiness & Heartachs.

There is something in my Case very extraordinary and out of the Common Road which I must not venture to Acquaint you with by Letter for fear of accidents &c—— I Could easily be eloquent in my wishes for others; since now I have nothing left, to wish for myself; If a hasty Prayr for yr. wellfare will show my sincerity. May you Enjoy a life of uninterrupted Calmness & repose unruffled either with passions or Disappoi[n]tmts, or if the wish is too extravagant, & it must be supposed that some of the ten thousand different heartaches, I am struggling with, must one time or other be yr. lot; Then “May you find a friend ready to hear & pitty you; whom both honour & humanity may Instruct to act towards you with sincerity and good nature. It probably happens well for you that I have a great many letters to answer this Post; otherwise I should not know how to give over. I am in great hast Yrs affectionaly

Skelton. Tuesday

L. Sterne

Twenty years later Dealtary had become the correspondent of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Newton. Once again, clerical duties in the diocese of York accounted for the friendship. Dealtary was now a pluralist: to his rectory of Skirpenbeck he had added the perpetual curacies of Bishop Wilton and Acaster Malbis, and, in 1758, the vicagage of Bishopthorpe, where he now resided. Bishopthorpe was the seat of the Archbishops of York. In 1757, the year of his elevation to that see, Dr. John Gilbert also became Lord Almoner. He persuaded George II to make Newton his Subalmoner. Gilbert, in addition, gave his friend and protégé ‘one of the most valuable pieces of preferment in the Church of York, the Precentorship.’ Besides Sterne, Newton met, at York, Dean Fountayne and the litigious Dr. Topham, both of whom he mentions in his letters. His occasional attendance upon the Archbishop in his diocese and presumably at Bishopthorpe doubtless made him acquainted with the engaging Dealtary.

In the autumn of 1759 Newton was living in Grosvenor Street, London, in close touch with Archbishop Gilbert and his family. Newton’s first surviving letter to Dealtary, dated October 9, made no mention of Sterne. But when on 4 March 1760 he again wrote to Deatary, this time from his dwelling in Mount Street, the first two volumes of *Tristram Shandy* had been published at York back in December, and Sterne had suddenly become one of the most celebrated authors in the kingdom. And what is more, Sterne was, it seems, arriving in London on this very day to enjoy his triumph.

Rumor about his book had preceded him, and rumor said he intended to make William Warburton, the distinguished new Bishop of Gloucester, Tristram's tutor in the next instalment of his novel. Dr. Newton wrote:

I wish Laury Sterne may have more comfort of his wife than he has had, but he has, and happy for him it is that he has, such a spring of good spirits in himself, and I suppose the success of *Tristram Shandy* has pleased him not a little. Many people are pleased even with the oddness and wildness of it, and no body more than the new Bishop of Gloucester, who says that it is wrote, in the very spirit of Rabelais, and has spoke to me highly of it several times, and inquired much after the author, and last Saturday made very honorable mention of it at the Bishop of Durham's [Richard Trevor] before six or seven of the Bishops, some of whom were rather offended with the levity of it, thinking it not in character for a clergyman. I hope therefore that there is no foundation of truth in the report I have heard, that Tristram is to have his education under the tutorage of Dr. Warburton. He may be as severe as he pleases upon impertinent fools and blockheads, but I do not love to see diamond cut diamond.

Newton, at the close of another letter to Dealtary, dated 9 December 1760, wrote that on the previous Sunday he had dined with Archbishop Gilbert and his daughter 'and some company with them. . . . Laury Sterne was there, who it seems arrived in town the night before.'

The third and fourth volumes of *Tristram Shandy* were published on 28 January 1761. On February 26 Newton reported that

The two last volumes of *Tristram Shandy* have had quite contrary success to the two former. It is almost as much the fashion to run these down, as it was to cry up the others. Not that I think there is that great difference between them, but certainly these are inferior in wit and humor, and in other respects are more gross and offensive. Our Archbishop is very angry with him for having broke his promise, and the last time he called there which is a month ago, he would not see him. All the Bishops and Clergy cry out shame upon him. All the graver part of the world are highly offended; all the light and trifling are not pleased; and the Bishop of Gloucester and I and all his friends are sorry for him. He has not come near us, and I believe is almost ashamed to see us. Garrick's advice to him was very good "Mr. St[er]ne you are in a very bad state of health; I would advise you to go into the country, to keep quiet upon your living, to take care of your health, and if you write any more of these things, be sure to mend your hand."

Yale University

L. P. CURTIS

## The Accretive Structure of Byron's "The Giaour"

"The Giaour" is perhaps Byron's most puzzling poem.<sup>1</sup> Constructed upon a simple story and containing neither thought nor imagery that is abstruse, the poem derives its structural complexity from the fact that what is regarded as the complete work is really the original poem covered with seven layers of accretion. E. H. Coleridge, in a "Bibliographical Note" preceding his edition of the poem, briefly traced the history of the additions to "The Giaour," and in a later footnote Coleridge indicated his own dissatisfaction with the work: "It is a hard matter to piece together the 'fragments' which make up the rest of the poem."<sup>2</sup> The point which Coleridge did not perceive and I hope to illustrate here is that all the 'fragments' in the poem, representing the result of accretion with occasional verbal alteration and no more than trivial deletion, do not constitute a whole that can be pieced together. Any consideration of the structure or imagery of "The Giaour" should begin with this proposition. Though Byron's intentions remain obscure, it is likely that he merely wished to expand the body of a short poem and to give both a full setting and a moral direction to a dramatic incident. Whatever were his intentions, he badly weakened the poem.

There are, E. H. Coleridge pointed out, an extant MS. of the first known version of "The Giaour," a proof of an intended first edition, and then seven editions (London: John Murray, [June 5—circa. November 27] 1813), of which all but the sixth contain accretion, expanding the poem from 407 lines in the MS. to 1334 lines, its final length, in the seventh edition. The following table, based upon a list presented by Coleridge in his "Bibliographical Note," summarizes the formal effect of the successive accretion:

MS	Proof	First Edition	Second Edition	Third Edition	Fourth Edition	Fifth (Sixth) Edition	Seventh Edition
1-6			7-20	21-45			
			46-102				
						103-167	

<sup>1</sup> This examination of "The Giaour" is related to a study of Byron's poetry which has been made possible by a grant from the Committee on the Advancement of Research of the University of Pennsylvania.

<sup>2</sup> Ernest Hartley Coleridge, ed. *The Poetical Works of Lord Byron* (7 vols. London, 1898-1904), III, 78-80, 123n. All quotations are from this edition.



MS	Proof	First Edition	Second Edition	Third Edition	Fourth Edition	Fifth (Sixth) Edition	Seventh Edition
168-199				200-250			251-252
				253-276			
277-287				288-351			
352-503				504-518			
519-619							
655-688			620-654				
					689-722		
723-732							
	733-734						
735-737							
		738-746					
	747-786						
787-831							832-915
		916-998					
			999-1023				
							1024-1028
		1029-1079					
				1080-1098			
		1099-1126					
							1127-1130
						1131-1191	
							1192-1217
						1218-1256	
		1257-1318					
1319-1334							

The substantial differences caused by the expansion of the poem are found most significantly in the diffusion of the structure and the growing inconsistency in the characters of both the fisherman and the Giaour. Through the first edition the dramatic quality of the poem is dominant, the character of the fisherman remains unchanged, and that of the Giaour is simply broadened. With the second edition, however, contributing descriptive passages, both the essentially dramatic structure and the consistency in characterization begin to break down. By the distortion of the fisherman's narrative style in the third edition and the addition of unrelated incident in the fourth, the process continues to the introduction of unsubstantiated didactic

elements and the consequent dissolution of remaining structural unity in the fifth and seventh editions.

The MS. version of "The Giaour" opens with a description of the supposed tomb of Themistocles (which "First greets the homeward-veering skiff" [1-6]) followed by the picture of the fisherman as he pulls into shore at Port Leone. The fisherman begins his story of seeing the Giaour, whom he recognized by his "evil eye" as "one / Whom Othman's sons should slay or shun" (168-99). In the next section the speaker (we infer from the context that he is still the fisherman) records the passing of the Giaour: "He came, he went, like the Simoom, / That harbinger of Fate and gloom" (277-87). The fisherman, now clearly identifiable, continues his story, recalling how he took a band of men in his skiff to "The chennelled waters dark and deep," where they lowered their mysterious burden. He digresses upon the dangers when "Beauty lures the full-grown child," for, like many simple men, he finds an obvious moral value in what he tells, in this instance of the "Strange rumours in our city" concerning Leila's infidelity with the Giaour and her subsequent disappearance (352-503). The fisherman now recounts the ambush of Hassan (which has become known in the city because a "few returned to tell the tale / Of what befel in Parne's vale") and his dying recognition of the Giaour, also by the "the evil eye / That aids his envious treachery (519-619). The death of Hassan is then narrated, first by a speaker who is presumably the fisherman continuing his tale and then by the Giaour himself, who concludes: "My wrath is wreaked, the deed is done, / And now I go—but go alone" (655-88). There follows a description, again apparently by the fisherman, of the monument "at the spot where Hassan fell" commemorating "as true an Osmanlie / As e'er at Mecca bent the knee" (723-32, 735-37). The dialogue between the fisherman and the monk introduces the brief concluding episode in the poem. The fisherman recalls seeing the Giaour "many a year" before, and the monk complains of one "not of Othman race, / But only Christian in his face," who has been living among the brothers for "twice three years at summer tide" without taking vows or participating in the life of the cloister (787-831). The Giaour concludes his confession to the monk, emphasizing that he has felt sorrow rather than repentance and asking that in death he remain anonymous; the monk is bound to silence of course, so that, following the death of the Giaour, no more can be known of the substance of his confession than is revealed in the narrative (1319-34).

At this stage the poem depends principally upon the dramatic device of monologue, by which the fisherman reveals enough of his own beliefs to appear well motivated.

The proof described by E. H. Coleridge makes two additions. The first, an interpolation in the description of the monument at the site of Hassan's death, merely adds to the image of the ideal Osmanlie praying: "In orisons resumed anew / At solemn sound of 'Alla Hu!'" (733-34). The second is the curse upon the Giaour, presumably spoken by the fisherman, calling for eternal damnation but in this life vampirism, by which the Giaour shall destroy his future children (747-86). This addition is consistent with the image of the superstitious fisherman already rendered and makes inescapable at least the faint suggestion that the Giaour himself, somehow aware of the curse, has chosen the monastic retreat, where, without taking religious vows, he will necessarily live in celibacy and thereby avoid fulfillment of the second part of the curse.

The first published edition contributes five new passages to the poem. The earliest, following the description of Hassan as an ideal Osmanlie and preceding the curse upon the Giaour, adds the significant phrase regarding Hassan, "And unavenged, at least in blood," and then offers a corollary to the curse in the form of a description of the welcome that "the maids of Paradise" shall give to Hassan: "Who falls in battle 'gainst a Giaour / Is worthiest an immortal bower" (738-46). Next, following the exchange between the fisherman and the monk, an introduction to the Giaour's confession is added (916-98). The first part of this, a contemplative comment upon the effects of solitude, is transitional; the second records the beginning of the confession, in which the Giaour, contrasting the peace in the monk's life with his own tortured existence, makes it apparent that he simply wishes to break his solitude by sharing his secret rather than to seek forgiveness. In the third accretion (1029-79), the Giaour, continuing his confession, tells of the intensity of his love for Leila and the relief which he achieved by killing Hassan. His moral position is at once universal in its application but relativistic in its assumptions, for he would have done as Hassan did had Leila been false to him as well: "Faithless to him [Hassan]—he gave the blow; / But true to me—I laid him low" (1064-65). In the passage next added to the first edition (1099-1126), the Giaour repeats his assertion of the intensity of his love, concluding with a marriage image of death, by which he emphasizes the essentially physical nature of his attachment

for, and recollection of, Leila: "Ah! had she but an earthly grave, / This breaking heart and throbbing head / Should seek and share her narrow bed" (1124-26). In the final accretion (1257-1318), the Giaour, drawing toward the conclusion of his confession, makes explicit the fact that since his despair is stronger than both his will and the monk's prayers, he cannot seek forgiveness: "I want no Paradise but rest." He recalls his vision of Leila and pointedly foretells his own death. The apparition which he describes and his growing excitement fully express his preoccupation with her physical being, which now leads him to rejoice that she, buried in the sea, can escape from her grave ("With braided hair, and bright-black eye— / I knew 'twas false—she could not die!" [1300-01]), while Hassan "comes not—for he cannot break / From earth" (1304-05). This is clearly inconsistent with his earlier reference to her grave, but in matters of logic rather than of feeling consistency would hardly be characteristic of the Giaour's behavior at this time. In the poem as it was first published the emphasis has been shifted from the fisherman's narrative toward the Giaour's confession, developing thereby the irony of the final situation of the unbelieving Giaour.

The second edition of the poem adds four passages. The first, a continuation of the opening lines, describes the "Fair clime" of the setting (7-20). The next (46-102) is a digressive description, in which the speaker emphasizes that this lovely spot in Nature becomes the scene of man's most violent deeds; he compares the scene ("Greece, but living Greece no more") with the face of one just dead, "Before Decay's effacing fingers / Have swept the lines where Beauty lingers." The third addition is an essentially descriptive insertion (620-54) in a dramatic passage, the fisherman's account of the ambush and death of Hassan: the meeting of the forces of Hassan and the Giaour in the fatal battle is compared with the junction of a river with the ocean. The fourth, placed between the Giaour's opening statement in his confession and his story itself, is the Giaour's somewhat formalized expression of his sense of past joy, present hopelessness, and fearless dedication to Love rather than Glory (999-1023). In the light of this accretion, the second edition would seem to reveal the beginning of a shift in the structure of the poem from dramatic to descriptive emphasis. There is a faint suggestion, in both the extended setting and the Giaour's somewhat analytical remarks upon his own emotions, of didacticism developing in what initially was a self-sustaining episode.

The third edition brings, first, further expansion of the opening description, in this instance the image of the nightingale and the rose, which in turn foretells the nature of the central situation in the tale (21-45). Next, the fisherman's account of seeing the Giaour is extended to include a description of the Giaour's hesitation and presumed preoccupation with thoughts of violence before he disappears (200-50, 253-76). Between the fisherman's story of the passing of the Giaour and his account of the death of Leila, there now occurs a somewhat meditative description of the solitude of Hassan's hall, in which the speaker foretells Hassan's death. Here the fisherman is intellectually out of character, both in the nature of his observations and in his artfulness in anticipating Hassan's death, so that an element designed to strengthen the tension leading to the scene of ambush actually weakens it. The next addition, an expansion for rhetorical reasons of the fisherman's description of Leila (504-18), is an extended comparison of the girl to the cygent, which is also inconsistent with the character that the fisherman has assumed through preceding versions of the poem. The final contribution of the third edition (1080-98) is the Giaour's anticlimactic account of a scene which has already been effectively dramatized, the death of Hassan.

The only interpolation made by the fourth edition, between the fisherman's story of the death of Hassan and the description of the monument, is the account of his mother's receiving news of his death (689-722). Intrinsically dramatic, the incident seen within the context of the poem at this stage of its growth seems to restrict the structural diffusion caused by the accretion in the second and third editions; but considered as an insertion in the fisherman's story as it was first presented in the MS. version of the poem, the scene has quite a different effect.<sup>3</sup>

The didactic elements implicit in some of the earlier accretion become explicit in the first two of the three passages added in the fifth edition. The first of these, immediately preceding the introduction of the fisherman, is an *ubi sunt* passage concerned with the Greeks (103-67). Developing organically from the foregoing com-

<sup>3</sup> Out of context this fragment would appear to be quite effective. Coleridge (III, 118 n) pointed to the parallel incident of the mother of Sisera in *Judges* (v: 28); and in perhaps the most recent comment on "The Giaour," Robert Escarpit (*Lord Byron, Un Tempérament Littéraire* [2 vols. Paris, 1957], II, 199) remarked, "C'est un thème universel que Byron a su admirablement rajeunir."

parison of modern Greece to recent death, this moves toward the construction of a didactic frame about the incidents of the "mournful tale." The Greeks are now mere "Slaves," remarks the narrator, "Without even savage virtue blest, / Without one free or valiant breast," who remain unresponsive to all efforts to free them: "In vain might Liberty invoke / The spirit to its bondage broke / Or raise the neck that courts the yoke" (155-56, 161-63). The narrator's position has become untenable, for the incidents of the tale, which are still essentially those of the first version of the poem, simply do not carry the implications suggested; to make such supposed meaning explicit is merely to vitiate the dramatic power of the tale. A further expansion of the Giaour's confession (1131-91) is the second, and even less appropriate, accretion in the fifth edition. Here the Giaour, who has just revealed and will soon reiterate the intensely physical nature of his love for Leila, is made to give a Neoplatonic cast to his recollections: "Love indeed is light from heaven; / A spark of that immortal fire," a means "by Alla given, / To lift from earth our low desire" and at the same time to participate in the being of the Godhead, "A ray of Him who formed the whole; / A Glory circling round the soul!" (1131-40). The Giaour's distraught state during much of the confession is hardly sufficient reason for this kind of inconsistency, which involves two extreme views of life. In the third addition, also falling within the story of the confession, the Giaour recalls a friend of past years (1218-56), who prophesied the Giaour's doom and to whom the Giaour would now have the monk take a final message. This introduces an element for which there has been no preparation and can be no resolution.

The seventh edition has five new passages. The first is not structurally significant (251-52). The next (832-915), following the dialogue between the fisherman and the monk, recounts the relationship between the fisherman and the Giaour, emphasizing the conflict between them but contributing nothing to the tension that arises from the Giaour's personality at the time of the confession. The third addition (1024-28), following the Giaour's insistence during confession on the intensity of his feeling, is a rather trite digression on death, completely inconsonant with the emotional tone of the Giaour's speeches immediately preceding and following it and totally inconsistent with the emotional tone of the Giaour's speeches immediately preceding and following it and totally inconsistent with what may be regarded as the original character of the Giaour. "Then



let life go to Him who gave," he concludes. "I have not quailed to Danger's brow / When high and happy—need I now?" The fourth accretion is a quatrain, recognizably Platonic (see Coleridge, III. 136n), which closes the Giaour's repeated affirmation of love for Leila:

She was the form of Life and Light,  
That, seen, became a part of sight;  
And rose, where'er I turned mine eye,  
The Morning-star of Memory! (1127-30)

This precedes and doubtless prepares for that passage which I have described as Neoplatonic, but this fact only emphasizes the devastating effect that the later accretion has upon the character of the Giaour. In the final expansion (1192-1217), the Giaour is made to reiterate, rather profusely, the intensity of his sorrow and then to stress what he has both asserted and demonstrated, that he "Looks not to priesthood for relief," a matter on which he now proceeds to lecture the monk in a rather pointless sequence.

*University of Pennsylvania*

WILLIAM H. MARSHALL

## "Orion" in "The Wreck of the Deutschland"

The passage in question is in the twenty-first stanza of the poem:

Thames would ruin them;  
Surf, snow, river and earth  
Gnashed: but thou art above, thou Orion of light;  
Thy unchancelling poisoning palms were weighing the worth,  
Thou martyr-master: in thy sight  
Storm flakes were scroll-leaved flowers, lily showers—sweet  
heaven was astrew in them.<sup>1</sup>

The general meaning of the lines is clear enough. Hopkins has told us how the nuns have been exiled from Germany, and cannot find haven in England. Now he returns to the storm. The elements too are "unkind" (st. 13), and seem to be hunting the nuns down, as if they were dogs with gnashing teeth.<sup>2</sup> But even in the midst of the storm Christ is present, as the constellation Orion still shines above

<sup>1</sup> W. H. Gardner, ed., *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, Third Edition (New York and London, 1948), p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> See Gardner's note, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

the clouds. It is Christ who has driven the nuns westward from their sanctuary. He has "unchancelled" them.<sup>3</sup> He is the master of martyrs, the ruler who commands and judges them, but he can be their leader only because he is himself the master-martyr, the archetypal example of the unmerited suffering which they must re-experience. "The martyrs," says Hopkins in a sermon, "follow [Christ] through a sea of blood."<sup>3b</sup> Christ can see the storm as evil and a cause of suffering, but he can also see it as blessed because of the outcome of this suffering. The Prince of the Power of Air seems to have been liberated in the storm, and the wind from a "cursed quarter" (st. 13) seems to have been raised by the devil. But the storm is really from God. It is "the dark side of the bay of [his] blessing" (st. 12). In Christ's sight the storm-flakes are showers of lilies to crown the martyrs. And these flowers are "scroll-leaved," that is, they are "worded." They speak for Christ, and express his judgment of the nuns, just as in the next stanza the fact that there are five nuns is symbolic of the five wounds of Christ which "letter the lamb's fleece." However evil the storm seems, the passage says, it has an ultimately good purpose, for whatever happens in nature is from God or is turned to his uses.

But why Orion? Is it simply because Orion is a constellation forming an heroic human figure and therefore an apt image of Christ? Is there any traditional justification for using Orion in this way? Perhaps Hopkins has merely gone on from the metaphor of "surf, snow, river and earth" as gnashing dogs, to suggest that Orion (i.e., Christ) is the mighty hunter of souls directing these dogs and controlling them. (The constellation Orion, after all, is associated with two constellations of dogs, *canis major* and *canis minor*.) This is certainly part of the meaning. And it would be supported by Hopkins' general theory of classical myth,<sup>4</sup> and by his notion that the

<sup>3</sup> See Gardner's note in *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A Selection of His Poems and Prose* (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1953), p. 218. One might add that the chancel is the area in the eastern side of a church near the altar. Only priests and the choir can go there during service. It is called "chancel" from the crisscross fretwork of barrier lattices which shuts it in.

<sup>3b</sup> Christopher Devlin, ed., *The Sermons and Devotional Writings of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (London, 1959), p. 35.

<sup>4</sup> For Hopkins classical myth is valid, if at all, only as a veiled allegory, a shadowy parallel or anticipation of the Christian story, especially that part of the Christian story having to do with Christ's defeat of the devil. So, in a letter to Dixon, after damning the Greek gods as "not gentlemen and ladies," he goes on to say: "But I grant that the Greek mythology is very susceptible of fine treatment, allegorical treatment for instance, and so treated gives rise to the most beautiful results" (Claude Collier Abbott, ed., *The*

stars are a "piece-bright paling" through which heaven shines—"Christ and his mother and all his hallows."<sup>5</sup> But a great deal more than this is working in the reference to Orion. And this more suggests that in some cases at least Hopkins must be read not simply in the light of Scotus or St. Ignatius, but also in the light of the general tradition of classical-Christian symbolism. In Hopkins is still alive that way of writing poetry which we associate, say, with Donne, Herbert, or Vaughan, or with medieval and renaissance poetry generally.

The standard classical, medieval, and renaissance tradition about Orion derives from meteorological notions. The constellation rises in the late fall and sets in the spring. Throughout the tradition, from Virgil to the seventeenth century, Orion is seen as a bringer of storms and rain. Virgil calls him "*nimbosus*" and "*aquosus*."<sup>6</sup> Horace associates him with "Notus," the South wind, and with shipwreck: "*Me quoque devexi rabidus comes Orionis / Illyricis Notus obruit undis*."<sup>7</sup> Gregory,<sup>8</sup> Rabanus Maurus,<sup>9</sup> the second Vatican mythographer,<sup>10</sup> Honorius Augustodunensis,<sup>11</sup> Cornelius a Lapide,<sup>12</sup> Milton,<sup>13</sup> and Alexander Ross<sup>14</sup> all tell us with monotonous regularity that

*Correspondence of Gerard Manley Hopkins and Richard Watson Dixon* (London, 1955), p. 147. And so Hopkins writes a poem giving a Christian interpretation to the story of Perseus and Andromeda (*Poems*, p. 89); he refers in "The Wreck" to the "beat of endragonèd seas" (st. 27); and in his analysis of the Apocalypse in his spiritual writings he discusses the way a Dragon is a proper symbol of the Devil, bringing in evidence from "the religions of heathendom" as well as from Scripture (*The Sermons and Devotional Writings*, p. 199). It is even possible that Hopkins remembered Orion in "The Wreck" because the story of Orion's defeat by the earth-scorpion was an ironic reversal of the stories of Perseus or St. George. But Hopkins' Orion is an "Orion of light," and therefore victorious, whereas the proud pagan hunter was defeated. (See Hyginus (*Poet. Astron.*, 2, "Scorpius"), where we are told that the constellation Scorpio was originally the scorpion which killed Orion, and that it has been placed in the heavens by Jupiter as a warning against too great self-confidence.)

<sup>5</sup>"The Starlight Night," *Poems*, pp. 70, 71. And see also Humphry House and Graham Storey, eds., *The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (London, 1959), p. 47, where Hopkins speaks of the "lantern of night, pierced in eyelets," and p. 254, where he says: "As we drove home the stars came out thick: I leant back to look at them and my heart opening more than usual praised our Lord to and in whom all that beauty comes home."

<sup>6</sup>*Aen.*, 1: 535; 4: 52.

<sup>7</sup>*PL*, 75: 866.

<sup>8</sup>*Carm.*, 1: 28: 21.

<sup>9</sup>*PL*, 111: 273, 274.

<sup>10</sup>G. H. Bode, ed., *Scriptores rerum Mythicarum Latini tres Romae nuper reperti* (Gottingen, 1834), p. 118.

<sup>11</sup>*PL*, 172: 145.

<sup>12</sup>"Commentaria in Amos Prophetam," *Commentaria in Duodecim Prophetas Minores* (Venice, 1703), p. 216.

<sup>13</sup>*Paradise Lost*, 1: 305, 306.

<sup>14</sup>*Mystagogus Poeticus, or The Muses Interpreter* (London, 1653), pp. 334, 335.

Orion stirs up tempests, and brings rain, hail, and snow. The traditional belief was that if Orion was visible, fine weather would follow; if he was obscured, storms would come. This association with storms and rain is derived not only from the fact that Orion rises during the stormy weather of late fall, but also from the myth of Orion's birth. Orion, so the story goes, was conceived from the urine of Jupiter, Mercury, and Neptune. And the name "Orion" was often etymologized from "urine."<sup>15</sup> So Honorius Augustodunensis says: "*Inde est Orion, qui ab urina natus, inter sidera est translatus. Hujus stellæ si fulgent, serenum erit; si obscurantur, tempestas.*" Cornelius a Lapide repeats Honorius almost word for word, and Alexander Ross keeps the tradition going.

The wreck of the *Deutschland* occurred on the night of December 7, 1875, at a time when Orion would have been shining in full force, though obscured by cloud. Hopkins' use of Orion in a poem about a winter storm is thus perfectly justified by the tradition.

But is there any more to it than this? The meteorological interpretation seems hardly enough to justify the identification of Orion with Christ. The fact is, however, that there is a long tradition associating Orion specifically with the martyrs of the Church. The ultimate sources of this tradition are the passages in the Bible which mention Orion, especially Amos 5:8 and Job 9:9. Biblical commentators from Gregory to Cornelius a Lapide interpret the Old Testament references to Orion as tropological foreshadowings of the martyrs. The basic text here seems to be Gregory's commentary in the *Moralia* on Job 9:9: "*Qui facit Arcturum, et Orionas, et Hyadas, et interiora Austri.*" Arcturus, says Gregory, is the Church, Orion the martyrs, and the Hyades the doctors of the Church.<sup>16</sup> Gregory's interpretation and his explanation of it is echoed through the centuries, and appears to have been the standard exegesis. Rabanus Maurus in his *De Universo*, for example, quotes Gregory almost word for word without reference to him,<sup>17</sup> and hundreds of years later Cornelius a Lapide quotes him directly in his commentary on Amos.<sup>18</sup> Of the three commentaries Hopkins is perhaps most likely to have seen either Gregory or Cornelius. Perhaps he saw one or the other at St. Beuno's College, in North Wales, where he wrote "The Wreck" while he was in the midst of his theological studies. Gregory was a basic authority,

<sup>15</sup> For example, by the second Vatican mythographer (loc. cit.), and by Alexander Ross (op. cit., p. 335).

<sup>16</sup> Loc. cit., 865-868.

<sup>17</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>18</sup> Op. cit., p. 217.

and Cornelius was a Jesuit whose commentaries were often reprinted. The works of either would have been likely to be in the library at St. Beuno's. In any case, the association of Orion with the martyrs is such a persistent tradition that it seems very likely that Hopkins may have encountered it somewhere.

This seems even more likely when we turn to Gregory's development of his identification of Orion and the martyrs, and see how it illuminates the passage in "The Wreck of the Deutschland":

*Quid igitur post Arcturum per Orionas nisi martyres designantur? Qui, dum sancta Ecclesia ad statum prædicationis erigitur, pondus persequentium molestiasque passuri, ad cæli faciem quasi in hieme venerunt. His etenim natis, mare terraque turbata est, quia dum gentilitas mores suos destrui, apparente illorum fortitudine doluit, in eorum necem non solum iracundos ac turbidos, sed etiam placidos erexit. Ex Orionibus itaque hiems inhorruit, quia, clarescente sanctorum constantia, frigida mens infidelium ad tempestatem se persecutionis excitavit. Orionas ergo cælum edidit, cum sancta Ecclesia martyres misit. Qui dum loqui recta rudibus ausi sunt, omne pondus ex frigoris adversitate pertulerunt.*<sup>10</sup>

The storms of winter, then, are symbols of the persecution the martyrs arouse by their very sanctity. At a time when the pagan culture is losing its moral fiber, the fortitude of the martyrs is more than the unbelievers can stand. Even the peaceful among the heathen, as well as the rabblers, are stirred up to murderous rage in this wintertime of the Church. Gregory is here turning the meteorological tradition about Orion to his own uses. Orion causes storms, Gregory is saying, not because it is evil but because it is good, just as the martyrs stir up storms of persecution because their very courage and goodness is intolerable to the wicked and degenerate disbelievers. So the martyrs are sent by the Church, as Orion is sent by heaven, for the martyrs must bear upon themselves all the weight of persecution, just as Orion must endure the weight of winter. "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church." The suffering of the martyrs is a witness to Christ and spreads the faith at a time when it is just establishing itself. But the death of the martyrs also appeases the wrath of persecution and bears it away, leaving the Church more free to act, just as Christ, the martyr-master, took upon himself the sins of the world, appeased the wrath of God against mankind, and thus made it possible for man to escape from the original sin. So, in Cornelius, Orion is a harbinger of spring with its flowers, as well as a bringer of

<sup>10</sup> Loc. cit., 866; Cornelius quotes this passage exactly, but omits the second and third sentences.

storms.<sup>20</sup> The storms of persecution, and the martyrdom they cause, are necessary to the triumph of the Church in the spring.

All this is immediately applicable to the passage in "The Wreck of the Deutschland." We can see now that the storm which wrecks the Deutschland is a kind of extension of the persecution which has driven them from Germany. And Christ, the martyr-master, is indeed "weighing the worth" of the nuns' suffering in his "poising palms," just as Orion poises the club and sword in his hands. He is testing the pain of the nuns to see if it is great enough to appease the divine wrath of the storm and bring on the spring, with its flowers, its showers of grace, and its resultant salvation for others. The suffering of afflictive grace is a necessary prelude to the sweet descent of elevating grace.

And the suffering of the nuns is indeed great enough. It transforms the malign storm into the freshening showers of grace, in which sweet heaven is astrew. Just as Christ's death at Easter makes possible the lilies of Spring and the salvation of mankind, so Hopkins suggests (st. 31) that the death of the nuns may have made possible the salvation of the fallen souls on board the Deutschland: ". . . is the shipwreck then a harvest, does the tempest carry the grain for thee?" In the sight of Christ, the Orion of light, evil is transformed into good, and the storm flakes are indeed "scroll-leaved flowers, lily showers," in all the multiplicity of meanings we have found for this transformation.

The symbolism of stanza 21 of "The Wreck of the Deutschland" derives from traditional sources, particularly from the tradition of medieval and renaissance Biblical commentary. The interpretation of this passage in the light of the tradition does not produce a meaning inconsistent with Hopkins' general attitude toward classical myth, with his notions about stars, or with the Ignatian drama of the poem. But merely to recognize the presence of these constant Hopkinsian assumptions does not lead to a full understanding of the passage. It is possible that many other passages in Hopkins must be interpreted in the same way, and that we must often refer to the tradition of Biblical commentary, as well as to the *Exercises* of St. Ignatius or to the *Opus Oxoniense* of Scotus, for a complete reading of Hopkins' poems.

The Johns Hopkins University

J. HILLIS MILLER

---

<sup>20</sup> Op. cit., p. 216.



## The Order of Yeats's *Last Poems*

Yeats always carefully planned the order of the poems which make up his various collections. Among the Yeats papers in Dublin are many manuscript drafts of tables of contents, going all the way back to *The Wind Among the Reeds* and coming forward all the way to *Last Poems*. Since several writers have speculated whether the order in which *Last Poems* appear in the collected editions represents Yeats's intentions, I reproduce below his manuscript table of contents for *Last Poems*. The numbers as well as the titles are in Yeats's hand; the list has no title or heading:

1. Under Ben Bulbin
2. Three Songs to One Burden
3. The Black Tower
4. Cuchulain Comforted
5. Three Marching Songs
6. In Tara's Halls
7. The Statues (Would like another copy if George takes this to Dublin)
8. News for the Delphic Oracle
9. The Long Legged Fly
10. A Bronze Head
11. A Stick of Incense
12. Hound Voice
13. John Kinsella's Lament etc.
14. High Talk
15. The Apparitions
16. A Nativity
17. Man and Echo
18. The Circus Animal's Desertion
19. Politics
20. Cuchulain's Death
21. Purgatory

(Quoted with the permission of Mrs. W. B. Yeats)

It will be noticed at once that this list includes all of the poems in *Last Poems* except three poems Yeats had put in *On the Boiler* ("Why should not Old Men be Mad," "Crazy Jane on the Mountain," and "The Statesman's Holiday"), and that their order is that followed in the Cuala Press' *Last Poems and Two Plays* (Wade, item 200), and not that found in the collected editions. Since this manuscript

table of contents includes poems on which Yeats was working in January 1939, it must be one of the last things he ever wrote. It establishes the fact that Yeats himself was responsible for the order of *Last Poems and Two Plays* even though that book appeared after his death.

Grinnell College

CURTIS BRADFORD

## Ishmael and the Problem of Formal Discontinuities in *Moby Dick*

An aspect of *Moby Dick* that Melvillians either take for granted or notice with uneasiness, without offering a satisfactory solution, seems to be the novel's modal heterogeneity.<sup>1</sup> Ishmael's narrative ranges through a gamut of styles that includes the colloquial, comical, descriptive, didactic and lyrical. This in itself is understandable, particularly in view of Melville's affinity for the Elizabethans. But when the mode of presentation abruptly changes from the first-person fictional convention established at the outset to the theatrical asides purporting to reveal the privacy of Ahab's mind, or of Starbuck's and Stubb's, and to the dramatized turmoil of the whole crew assembled in the forecabin, with apparently incongruous stage directions,<sup>2</sup> we may ask if this leap violates the formal unity of the book. One example of such a glaring transition is to be found in Chapter 119:

"Bad work, bad work! Mr. Starbuck," said Stubb, regarding the wreck, "but the sea will have its way. Stubb, for one, can't fight it. You see, Mr.

<sup>1</sup> For instance, Gabriele Baldini in *Melville o le ambiguità* (Milan, 1952) calls *Moby Dick* a "cento," while John Parke, author of "Seven Moby-Dicks" in *Interpretations of American Literature* ed. by Feidelson and Brotkorb (New York, 1959), downgrades Ishmael, for similar reasons, to the status of a mere narrative "device" having the only purpose of introducing us to Ahab, the real protagonist. R. W. Short, author of "Melville as Symbolist" in *Interpretations*, cit., speaks of "incongruity" and of Melville's inability to create solid characters. Richard Sewall, in *The Vision of Tragedy* (New Haven, 1959) notices a shift in focus when Ishmael disappears from the stage to make room for Ahab; Granville Hicks instead, author of "A Re-reading of *Moby Dick*" in *Twelve Original Essays on Great American Novels* (ed. Charles Shapiro, Detroit, 1958), defends Ishmael's consistency as a dramatic persona and Melville's right "to break through the limitations of first-person narrative" to "enter directly into the mind of Ahab or any other characters."

<sup>2</sup> *Moby Dick*, chapters 37-40; also chapter 108 and chapters 120-122.

Starbuck, a wave has such a great long start before it leaps, all round the world it runs, and then comes the spring! But as for me, all the start I have to meet it, is just across the deck here. But never mind; it's all in fun: so the old song says"; — (*sings*)

Oh! jolly is the gale, etc.

At the end of the chantey the narrative convention is re-established by an "Avast Stubb," cried Starbuck, . . ." and sustained until Ahab's celebrated address to the spirit of fire occasions an interjected stage-direction that breaks once again the storytelling approach:

" . . Oh, thou clear spirit, of thy fire thou madest me, and like a true child of fire, I breathe it back to thee." (*Sudden, repeated flashes of lightning; the nine flames leap length-wise to thrice their previous height; etc. . . .*) . . . "The boat! the boat!" cried Starbuck, . . .

These repeated modal shifts make for an instability of point of view which prompts some critics to discount Ishmael as a realized and consistent actor-spectator, and to consider him as a mere narrative device Melville feels free to discard when he sees fit. On this showing, Ishmael would fare very poorly when compared with another famous fictional narrator — Huckleberry Finn.

Yet Melville had consistently used the autobiographical convention in the five novels that preceded *Moby-Dick*, and it was only in the last named that he allowed himself the modal discontinuities which seem to crack the unifying frame of first-person narration in the past tense. We can therefore assume that he was deliberately experimenting with his favorite fictional form, and if so, a closer look at the much-discussed masterpiece should yield some clue to the peculiar design he was thus striving to achieve. The imaginative contract he initially undertook to fulfill with his reader might then prove to have been honored in a subtler way than was expected.

To begin with, in the crucial chapter-clusters where modes switch, the sequence reveals a significant order. Chapter 37, which gives us Ahab's unspoken thoughts in the form of direct discourse, with the external presentation reduced to introductory stage directions in brackets, is prepared for by the ending of the previous chapter (" . . they all dispersed; and Ahab retired within his cabin."). Moreover, Chapter 36 itself contains an aside (interjected in the exchange between Ahab and Starbuck) that begins to tilt the prose form from narrative to dramatic. The chapter is full of lively dialogue anyway and marks a high point in the development of the action, with Ahab subduing Starbuck's dissent and winning over to

his demoniacal purpose the three harponeers, who are thus sworn in to kill Moby Dick at whatever cost. The whole scene is loud and intrinsically theatrical; the transition to Ahab's inner monologue, followed by Starbuck's antithetic one in Chapter 38 and by Stubb's half-muttered, half-hummed divagations in Chapter 39, achieves an immediacy of its own in the very lowering of tone.

Then, at the end of a very short chapter, Stubb emerges from his private, erratically carefree thoughts to answer Starbuck's call; and with this we are ready for a new outburst of theatrical action in the forecandle (Chapter 40). This picturesquely wild scene, with its sailor chanteys, its quick exchanges of jokes, insults and challenges, and its narrowly averted knife fight, functions like a diabolic chorus to Ahab's solo; and its ominous background is finally emphasized by Pip's lonely dismay in the storm. The return to a straight narrative form in Chapter 41 is skilfully modulated by the exclamatory beginning that reabsorbs all the turmoil in the narrator's own self without falling to an anticlimax:

I, Ishmael, was one of that crew; my shouts had gone up with the rest; my oath had been welded with theirs; and stronger I shouted, and more did I hammer and clinch my oath, because of the dread in my soul. A wild, mystical, sympathetic feeling was in me; Ahab's quenchless feud seemed mine. . . .

Because of its strategic collocation and of its intense tone, that initial phrase "I, Ishmael, was one of that crew" rivals the felicitous opening of the whole narration: "Call me Ishmael."

And in a way it is as if the book began again, with the problem of the albino whale, Ahab's involvement in it and its meaning to each and all of the crew members, Ishmael in particular. The shock of demoniac revelation, conveyed in Chapters 36-40 in the appropriate form of dramatic immediacy, starts Ishmael's wholly unacademic meditations on Moby Dick, Ahab, the Whiteness of the Whale and the chances of meeting the same whale twice in mortal combat. He is now endeavoring to understand the confusing world of which he was a part, and his own part in it, by recollecting the "emotion" (and commotion) in a present situation of "tranquillity." He is really trying to understand himself; this is why, in the brooding sequel to the first dramatic climax of the book, he is once again intensely present, as he was in the very first chapters.

Yet he is present here in a totally different way, for the Ishmael

of those chapters had the objective presence of a character involved in comical adventures told by the narrating voice, while now his presence is felt as the very presence of the evoker in the act of conjuring up the past: "I, Ishmael. . . ." In a direct comparison of this beginning with the first beginning of the book, significance attaches also to the equally crucial, if inverse, part the narrator's name plays in each: for it appears as an object of the conjuring verb "call" the first time, and as an apposition to the conjuring subject the second time — nor is the difference a purely grammatical one. The focus was on the remembered actor of the adventure in the former context, and is now on the remembering spectator. We shall see that this shift in Ishmael's role, and his subsequent self-effacement in his own narration, are of structural import.

The second appearance of the dramatic form occurs in Chapter 108, with the "Promethean" dialogue between Ahab and the carpenter. This is in itself less climactic than the first dramatic cluster, as described above, or than the third one, which it may be said to forecast. The emphasis in the dialogue is on thought rather than action, with a strong ironic effect resulting from the interplay of the carpenter's uncomprehending good humor and Ahab's titanic defiance. Action, however, is not wanting, since the carpenter happens to be working on Ahab's new whalebone leg which will enable the *Pequod's* hitherto secretive skipper to appear more freely on deck and establish a direct and frequent contact with his crew — with the momentous consequences we know. As for the dialogue itself, its poignant irony and philosophical overtones make it focal to an understanding of Ahab, who sarcastically likens his humbly creative interlocutor to the anthropomorphic God of popular religion by addressing him as "Maker," only to hurl against both the challenge of an unlimited Promethean freedom. He calls himself a "Greek god" and, like Diogenes, wants "a lantern" (the light of pure intellect) for he avowedly has no use for "a blind dome" (an unthinking head, as well as the cathedral of obscurantism) in the architecture of man. He wants an ideal man, untroubled by the weaknesses of the heart, superior to mere *homo faber* and his mechanical contrivances, towering in the strength of unhampered mind. In this *hybris* lies his greatness as well as his damnation, for he repudiates what Hawthorne would call the "common bond" of humanity for the sake of his intellectual pride, and that will make him threaten and silence, in the sequel to this scene, the voice of reason in humane Starbuck (Chapter 109).

Faustian man imperiously states his need for infinity, and he would probably scoff at the carpenter even if the latter could "work in clay" like the traditional God; in this arrogance he has his nobility and his demonic self-destructiveness, as he well knows since he himself mentions to his dazed interlocutor the "fiery pains of hell," and when shortly after he brandishes a musket at Starbuck, we know that the demonic side is gaining the upper hand. "Queequeg in his coffin" (Chapter 110) seals this rapid sequence with an ill omen magically attendant on Ahab's dark victory. Thus the emergence of a theatrical mode in Chapter 108, well anticipated by previous discussion of our competent and unthinking carpenter, marks a climax too, albeit a minor one — and it should be added that the scene begins and ends with a soliloquy on the part of the carpenter, as if to stress the fact that his exchange with Ahab is no real exchange, but a mock dialogue.

The third and final dramatic cluster centers on Chapters 119-122, and it constitutes a major climax, symmetrical to the earlier one in Chapters 36-40. The elements erupt as Ahab addresses the god of fire and binds the crew to his demoniac covenant ("The Candles"); as in the other cluster, which it resembles in many ways, the emergence of theatrical form is announced by the mixed mode of the first chapter of the series and culminates in a chorus of mates and crew. The latter is now represented by Tashtego on the main-top-sail yard, echoing with his mutter the thunder and lightning, although the whole crew has appeared around Lucifer-like Ahab in "The Candles"; and in between, the inevitable exchange of Ahab with Starbuck takes place (Chapter 120). We might observe that Chapter 118 ("The Quadrant") ushers in the whole scene by showing Ahab as destroyer of the all-too-rational instrument, and finds a symmetrical echo afterwards in Chapter 124 with the ominous inversion of the compass-needle. Though Ahab had asserted the supremacy of intellect in his talk with the carpenter, he is now discarding reason for magnetism; the demonic side (extrinsically symbolized by Fedallah) now dominates both the ship and his mind, as the blood-baptism of the harpoon had made clear in Chapter 113: "Ego te non baptizo in nomine patris, sed in nomine diaboli!"

This last series of theatrical chapters prolongs itself, through "The Log and the Line," "The Life-Buoy" and the interjected "The Pequod meets the Rachel" (Ch. 128), in two additional dramatic ones: "The Deck" (Ch. 127) and "The Cabin" (Ch. 129). In "The Log and the Line" the crew tries to determine the position



of the ship, with what rudimentary instruments are left after Ahab's outbursts; in "The Life-Buoy" a sailor dies and is buried, ironically enough, in a "life-buoy," while "The Deck" reverses the irony by envisioning Queequeg's coffin as a life-preserver — which it will indeed become for Ishmael at the end of the adventure. Finally in Chapter 129, after the meeting with the ship that bears the name of Rachel, and that will pick up the lonely survivor of the *Pequod's* shipwreck, we hear Ahab talking to Pip in a return of humane mood, and Pip uttering intimations of death by water. The dramatic coda to our third cluster points to the resolving catastrophe.

Obviously, then, the theatrical scenes are focal, and structurally related. The first marks the turn to tragic action and Ishmael's "second beginning" as actor-spectator, and the last precipitates Ahab's and the *Pequod's* doom; it is foreshadowed by the intermediate one of Chapter 108 and sequel. After "The Candles" there will be no more cetological digressions, only epic, lyrical or dramatic prose directly relevant to the action, and Ishmael will no longer assert his presence as actor as in Chapter One, or as remembering actor-spectator as in Chapter 41, but will stay in the background, practically disappearing in his narration until the epilogue of the shipwreck sees him come to the surface again in objective shape, a survivor in Queequeg's coffin. The result is a speeding of the narrative rhythm towards the vivid conclusion of the third day of the Chase, and this speed-up itself stands out the more effectively because it emerges from the leisurely digressive pace of the first half of the novel. Ishmael's receding to the backstage balances Ahab's striding to the fore, and this suggests that his relation to the hero is very much like Quentin Compson's to Colonel Sutpen in *Absalom, Absalom!*<sup>3</sup>

So far, however, we have only shown certain generally structural functions of the dramatic chapters in the overall design of the novel; we still have to prove that their insertion in the narrative flow takes place without breaking the basic convention subscribed by the author. Either Ishmael is an obliging device, to be ignored when the author needs omniscience, or he is a consistent fictional creation, like Compson or, say, Conrad's Marlow; either we see things through his imaginative mediation, or we eventually learn them from Melville when his

<sup>3</sup>It is to the credit of Richard Sewall, op. cit., that he has seen this momentous affinity, although he stops midway in his recognition of Ishmael's role in Melville's novel. Merlin Bowen instead, in *The Long Encounter* (University of Chicago Press, 1960), makes the important point that Ishmael attains self-liberation through acceptance and expression of objectivity.

talkative brainchild fails to sustain the part. Let us observe, then, that the switch from straight narrative in the past tense to dramatized monologue or scenic dialogue in the present tense is after all the mere heightening of a rhetorical device very common in the classical historians and poets, from Livy to Tacitus and Vergil, not to speak of Dante: the *historical present*, whereby the author who is telling his story of past events suddenly adopts the present tense to bring home to his audience the poignancy of some particular experience relived now.

A typical example would be Aeneas' recounting of the destruction of Troy to queen Dido in Book II of the *Aeneid*, where the historical present expresses the presentness of grief: "infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem" — and Aeneas really *renews* his sorrow in the act of reminiscing. In Dante's *Inferno*, an appropriate illustration would come from Canto V, lines 25-28, where he re-enacts in harrowed memory his entrance into Hell's second circle: "Now the painful voices begin to be heard; now I have come where much moaning strikes me. I came to a place bereft of light. . . ." Melville himself liberally uses the device, as in the beginning of *Typee*, where the breezy introductory paragraphs sustain the illusion of an action contemporary to the telling of it, before shifting to the verbal perspective of the past. Now, if we accept Goethe's theory that epic poetry has to do with the past while dramatic poetry unfolds an action imagined as present, Melville's shift from one mode to the other within a narrative (i. e. epic) work will appear to embody the natural movement of memory striving to recapture lost actuality. Ishmael, like Quentin Compson, like Aeneas, like Dante, is both historian and participant, and he spontaneously tries to pass, at the climactic points, from history as *historia rerum gestarum* to history as *res gestae* in the making; the shift takes place entirely within his consciousness. "I, Ishmael, was one of that crew . . . ;" it is as if he were saying: "I am the man, I suffered, I was there."

And with a slight modification of another line from the same stanza of *Song of Myself*, Ishmael could also say: "I do not describe the wounded man, I myself become the wounded man. . . ." For he is a conjurer endeavoring to evoke, to make present, his improbable hero: "Ahab, my Captain, still moves before me in all his Nantucket grimness and shagginess. . . ." <sup>4</sup> In this perspective, Ahab's, Starbuck's and the other crew members' asides do not lose plausibility; they are

<sup>4</sup> *Moby Dick*, chapter 33.

the conjuring narrator's imaginative reconstruction of the characters he knew, the *As If* of imagination becoming a presentational *Here*. Melville's Elizabethan asides look forward to Faulkner's italicized stream-of-consciousness passages in the course of which Thomas Sutpen and his harried family rise from the dead in Quentin Compson's voice. There has been James Joyce in between, of course; but in both *Moby Dick* and *Absalom, Absalom!* memory modulates into imagination, and we share the experience of creation in progress.

For Ishmael is the artist in the act of telling us, and struggling to understand, his crucial experience. When his autobiography becomes the history of the *Pequod* and Ahab, he is liberated from his "hypos" for the second time, and in a deeper sense: he attains the liberation of imaginative objectivity. Thus his vanishing from the stage after a certain point does not constitute a breach of poetical continuity, but a dialectical movement that reproduces and expands the repeated transition from narrative to drama, from memory to visionary actuality, from conjuring subjectivity to conjured objectivity. It will help to recall that Chapter 32 ("Cetology") humorously describes the sizes of the various species of whales in terms of book-formats, an obvious literary metaphor, and that the allusions to the story as a book in the making (often attuned to self-mockery) abound significantly.<sup>5</sup>

If so, it should be possible to accept Ishmael as a *persona* of Melville, invisibly present *through* his narration when he ceases to be directly present *in* it; and that this persona, even as he ceases to have objective existence, has dramatic existence as actor-spectator of a half-remembered, half-conjured action. Ishmael is the self-ironizing writer seeking, and finally achieving, realization through self-effacement in the work of art; following him in the process, we see the poetry arise from its (cetological) materials, and the discontinuities acquire the meaning of imaginative gestures within the context of a work in progress. They are indeed the structural equivalents of the copious hyperboles which animate Melville's baroque prose.

Rutgers University

GLAUCO CAMBON

<sup>5</sup> See the end of chapter 32 ("Cetology"), the beginning of chapter 63 ("The Crotch"), the end of chapter 102 ("A Bower in the Arsacides"), and the passage in chapter 104 ("The Fossil Whale") that begins: "One often hears of writers that rise and swell with their subject, though it may seem but an ordinary one. How, then, with me, writing of this Leviathan? . . ."

## Robert Frost's "Directive": A Theological Reading

Robert Peters's recent interpretation of Robert Frost's "Directive"<sup>1</sup> carries conviction in many of its assumptions; but in attempting to prove his thesis point—that the nature of the religious experience described in the poem is highly personal and unorthodox—Mr. Peters misinterprets (I feel) or ignores certain important symbols which, as I interpret them, give "Directive" a theological bent rather than the purely humanistic bent suggested by Mr. Peters—though his thesis point remains valid in either case.

That the focus of the poem is indeed theological does not become apparent until the last six lines with their ironical references to the Grail and St. Mark,<sup>2</sup> carefully juxtaposed against the non-ironical, and very beautiful, concluding lines: "Here lie your waters and your watering place. / Drink and be whole again beyond confusion." But once one senses the significance of these allusions, one realizes that the virtue of being lost enough to find oneself lies, somehow, in finding oneself religiously; then, upon recapitulation, the key symbols—the two lost cultures, the house and the playhouse, the Grail, and the brook—clarify themselves.

The two lost cultures emerge as two religions, one possibly Judaism, the other certainly Christianity, that have, through institutionalism ("all this now too much for us"), lost their original force. (The stories of these two religions are recorded in the same Book, quite possibly the book referred to in the enigmatic line 13: "And there's a story in a book about it." Since, however, the passage which precedes this line may have an actual physical reference, the identification of the older religion with Judaism remains problematical.)

The ruined playhouse of the children, from which the quasi-Grail has been taken, is the Christian mythus. The main house that "was

<sup>1</sup> "The Truth of Robert Frost's 'Directive'," *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. LXXV, January 1960, pp. 29-30.

<sup>2</sup> Of this allusion, Mr. Peters says, "The lost and the saved conditions are the poet's themes, and the thought pivots in a way unique with Frost around St. Mark's well-known dictum (16: 16) 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned'." It seems more likely, however, that the poet had in mind the following more pertinent passage (Mark 4: 11-12): "And [Christ] said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables: / That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted and their sins should be forgiven them." It is generally supposed that Christ was speaking ironically here. Almost certainly that irony has carried over, at least partially, into Frost's allusion.

no playhouse but a house in earnest" is the earlier religion. This house, now "only a belilaced cellar hole. / . . . slowly closing," was watered by a brook "cold as a spring as yet so near its source, / Too lofty and original to rage"; that is, this early religion was very near to the source of the living God, of fundamental Truth.

The speaker does not wish to cast out the Grail — a part of the Christian mythos — though he views himself somewhat ironically for his attachment to this relic of the playhouse of the children (one of the "little things" that "could make them glad"). Nevertheless, he is not disturbed by this attachment. The playhouse, closely associated with the main house, was also, if at second hand, nourished by the waters of the brook of Truth from which one may "Drink and be whole again beyond confusion," and the goblet may well be of value to him in partaking of these waters. That is to say, Christian symbols may well aid one in finding the "lofty and original" God who still abides despite the vitiating effect of time and institutionalism.

Dallas, Texas

MARGARET M. BLUM

## On a Passage of Jaufré Rudel \*

I. The two lines which we want to discuss here are the first of the second stanza in the troubadour's famous song about his *amor de lonh*, his "far-away love."<sup>1</sup> In the introductory first stanza the poet tells us that the singing of the birds — it is spring time — which he hears from afar reminds him of a far-off love. It arouses such a longing in him that he walks along drooping his head in sullenness. The second stanza runs thus:<sup>2</sup>

### \* Abbreviations.

P.-C. = Pillet-Carstens, *Bibliographie der Troubadours*, Halle 1933.

Beiträge = *Beiträge zur altprovenzalischen Lyrik*, Florence 1939.

<sup>1</sup> Alfred Jeanroy, *Les Chansons de Jaufré Rudel*, 2nd edition, Paris, Champion,

<sup>2</sup> The text is nearly the same in all the editions of the poem listed by Pillet-Carstens as well as the following which appeared after that bibliography (1933), e.g., Alfredo Cavaliere, *Cento liriche provenzali*, Bologna 1938, p. 36; Martín de Riquer, *La lírica de los trovadores I*, Barcelona 1948, p. 105; Erhard Lommatzsch, *Leben und Lieder der provenzalischen Troubadours I*, Berlin 1957, No. 6; Rita Lejeune, "La Chanson de l'amour de loin de Jaufré Rudel" in *Studi in onore di Angelo Monteverdi*, Modena 1959, I, 403-442. All of them spell *Senhor* with a capital initial, indicating that for them the word means "God"; Lommatzsch even says so expressly in his glossary. There are, however, two exceptions: Stimming, who provided the first edition

8. Be tenc lo Senhor per veray  
per qu'ieu veirai l'amor de lonh;
10. mas per un ben que m'en eschay  
n'ai dos mals, quar tan m'es de lonh.
12. Ai! car me fos lai pelegris,  
si que mos fustz e mos tapis
14. fos pels sieus belhs huelhs remiratz!

Jeanroy — and other editors of this poem more or less like him — renders the first two lines as follows: "Je le tiens, certes, pour véridique le Seigneur par lequel je verrai l'amour lointain."

II. According to this translation it is through God that Jaufre hopes to see his far-away love. Indeed, not infrequently do the troubadours use God's name in connection with their love affairs. Here are some examples taken from troubadours of the oldest generation, Jaufre's predecessors or contemporaries. We start with William IX of Poitou, who says:

Enquer me lais Dieus viure tan  
c'aja mos mans soz so mantel!

P.-C. 183, 1 (ed. Jeanroy No. X); IV, 5-6.

Cercamon follows his example:

Dieu prejarai qu'ancar l'ades  
o que la vej'anar jazer.

P.-C. 112, 4 (ed. Jeanroy No. I); IV, 4.

Car m'an fag de midonz sebrar  
lauzenjador, cui Dieus azir!

P.-C. 112, 1 b (ed. Jeanroy No. II); II, 4.

Dieus! si poirai l'ora veder  
qu'eu puosca pres de lei jazer?

P.-C. 112, 3 (ed. Jeanroy No. V); VII, 6.<sup>a</sup>

Marcabrun, in a poem against love, invokes God as a witness that the man who allows himself to be oppressed by Love is a fool:

---

of our troubadour (1873), and Jeanroy himself in his first edition (1915). But Stimming spelt *deu* and *sarrazis* also with small initials, so that nothing could be inferred from the fact that he wrote *senhor* with a small *s*. The case is similar with Jeanroy's first edition. Although *senhor* and—in the translation—*seigneur* appear with small initials, we cannot say whether the different spelling in the second edition implied a difference in the interpretation of the two words.

<sup>a</sup> See also P.-C. 112, 1 c (Jeanroy No. III) III, 4; P.-C. 112, 3a (Jeanroy No. V) III, 6.



Ben es cargatz de fol fais  
 qui d'Amor es en pantalès.  
 Senher Deus, quan mala nais  
 qui d'aital foudat se pais!

P.-C. 293, 7 (ed. Dejeanne No. VII) III, 7.

In another poem by the same author in praise of Love, we read:

Qui's vol si creza fol agur,  
 sol Dieus mi gart de revolim!  
 Qu'en aital amor m'aventur  
 on non a engan ni refrim.<sup>4</sup>

P.-C. 293, 13 (ed. Dejeanne No. XIII) III, 2.<sup>5</sup>

Finally Jaufrè Rudel himself:

Quar a mon joi sui revertitz,  
 e laus en lieys e Dieu e lor.

P.-C. 262, 1 (ed. Jeanroy No. IV) IV, 4.<sup>6</sup>

The examples quoted above—and many others which could be added from troubadours of later times<sup>7</sup>—give an idea of the extent to which the Provençal poets mingled God with their amatory enterprises, and it is no surprise to see Jaufrè Rudel do what his predecessors and contemporaries had done. But can the two lines which interest us here really be interpreted as one of those cases of naive misuse of God's name? We do not think so. If a troubadour says (or is supposed to say): "I certainly regard as truthful the Lord, through whom I shall see the far-away love," what else does this mean but that God already has guaranteed<sup>8</sup> to the troubadour that he would see that far-away love? Or did the poet want to say that he would recognize God as God only in case he made him see that love? To ask this question is to answer it in the negative. But if, according to l. 9, it is really sure that Jaufrè will see his far-away love, why should he emphasize the difficulties to reach the place where his lady lives,

<sup>4</sup>The meanings of *revolim* and *refrim* are doubtful.

<sup>5</sup>See also P.-C. 293, 24 (ed. Dejeanne No. XXIV) IV, 1.

<sup>6</sup>Two pertinent passages occurring in the very poem we are dealing with here will be mentioned later.

<sup>7</sup>Appel, for instance, devotes a long note on p. LXXXVII of his great edition of Bernart de Ventadorn to a discussion of all the pertinent passages in this troubadour's poems. See also Scheludko, who deals with this question in general in *Zschr. für franz. Spr. und Lit.* 60, pp. 32-33, and V. Lowinsky, "Zum geistlichen Kunstlied, etc.," same periodical, XX (1898), 164-165.

<sup>8</sup>Cf., in this respect, Jeanroy's rendering *veray* by "véridique," and Anglade's translation in his *Anthologie des troubadours*, Paris, s.d., p. 31: "Je crois à la sincérité de Dieu: c'est pourquoi je verrai cet amour de loin."

why should he dream of going there in a pilgrim's garment and finally give up this plan, leaving to God the decision of what will happen? In a word, the poem, or at least the most beautiful part of it, might not have been written at all.

III. We therefore hold that the lord of whom Jaufre speaks in the second stanza of his poem cannot be God. Whereas, in the preceding discussion, we had to deal with a naive expression of religiosity, of whose inappropriateness the poets were hardly conscious, we would like to assign our two lines to a trend of thought of whose nature the troubadours were fully aware, because it constitutes a rather frequently used poetical motif. It is the idea that love not only makes of the lover a servant of the beloved lady, but also requires him to extend his feelings and submissiveness to every being that has any relation to the lady.

This motif, too,<sup>9</sup> is found from the beginning of troubadour poetry. William IX says:

Ja no sera nuils hom ben fis  
contr'amor, si non l'es aclis  
et als estranhs et als vezis  
non es consens  
et a totz sels d'aicels aizis  
obediens.

Obediensa deu portar  
a motas gens qui vol amar.

P.-C. 183, 11 (ed. Jeanroy No. VI) V and VI, 1-2.

Marcabrun contributes the following lines:

Per lieys am tot son linhatge  
e totz selhs que l'an lauzada.

P.-C. 293, 28 (ed. Dejeanne No. XXVIII) VI, 1-2.

While the few songs of Cercamon that have come down to us do not offer this motif, there is one in Jaufre Rudel, which is of special interest inasmuch as it shows the word *senhor* to stress the lover's submissiveness:

Totz los vezis apel *senhors*  
del renh on sos joys fo noiritz,  
e crey que'm sia grans honors

---

<sup>9</sup> Eduard Wechsler, *Das Kulturproblem des Minnesangs*, vol. I (the only one published), Halle 1909, pp. 172-173, gives eight examples of it, of which only one has been reproduced above, viz., that of Jaufre Rudel.

quar ieu dels plus envilanitz  
cug que sion cortes lejau.

P.-C. 262, 4 (ed. Jeanroy, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., No. III) IV, 1-5.

Later troubadours use the word for the same purpose in the same motif:

Per leis es razos e mezura  
qu'eu serva tota creatura,  
neis l'enemic dei apelar *senhor*.

Bern. de Vent. P.-C. 70, 13 (ed. Appel, p. 76) V, 5-7.

C'al sieu menoret mesatge<sup>10</sup>  
volria far tan grans honors  
c'al plus ric de totz mos *senhors*  
non fis tant per homenatge.

Raim. de Miraval P.-C. 406, 31 (ed. Kolsen,  
*Beiträge* No. 28) V, 5-8.

Tot ades sopei et azor  
al país on ma don'estai,  
e'n tenria neis per *senhor*  
un pastor que vengues de lai.

Arn. de Maruèlh (ed. Johnston No. V) IV, 1-4.

Qu'el mon non ai tant mortal enemic  
ab cui trobes o aize o lezer  
q'ieu vos pogues cubertamen vezer:  
anc a *seignor* mieills de cor non servic.<sup>11</sup>

Guill. de Saint-Didier P. C. 234, 11 (ed. Sakari  
No. VIII) IV, 5-8.

IV. Among the examples that offer the word *senhor* in connection with the expression of the troubadour's submissiveness, the last one, that from Guillem de Saint-Didier, is of special importance to us, because the poem from which it is taken shows some striking similarities with that of Jaufre Rudel which is under discussion here. Ll. 5-8 of stanza I of Guillem's poem run thus:

- Et ai l'amada, puois son pretz auzie,  
6. e re no n'ai mas quan lo bon esper;  
pero sivals, si la pogues vezer,  
8. ab sol l'esgart mi pogr'ill faire ric.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *mesatge* "servant."

<sup>11</sup> Translation: "In the world I do not have so mortal an enemy whom I would not serve more willingly than any lord, provided that I got through him an opportunity or possibility of seeing you in secret."

<sup>12</sup> Because of the somewhat unsatisfactory line 7 in Sakari's edition we have here reproduced the text Appel gave in his edition of Bernart de Ventadorn, p. 331.

Like Jaufre Rudel, Guillem is far from his lady, with whom, like the older troubadour in the Provençal biography,<sup>13</sup> he had fallen in love when he heard other people praise her. Like Jaufre again, Guillem feels the ardent desire to see his lady, and like Jaufre, finally, Guillem would be enchanted if she deigned only to cast a glance at him,<sup>14</sup> whenever he should see her.

The most conspicuous of those similarities, however, is that both the troubadours connect the expression of their submissiveness with the stipulation that the person whom they are ready to call *senhor* should be instrumental to their seeing the beloved lady. To my knowledge, no other poem combines these two ideas, and it would be next to miraculous that two troubadours should have found this combination independently from each other. We are convinced that Guillem de Saint-Didier imitated Jaufre Rudel, who belonged to the generation prior to his own, and that Guillem's four lines starting with *Qu'el mon non ai tan mortal enemic* shed a new light on Jaufre's two which form the topic of this paper. In Guillem's text, it is out of the question that the lord whom he promises to serve could be God. After the foregoing discussion the same is true, we think, of Jaufre Rudel's poem; here, too, the word *senhor* is to be spelt with a small initial, because it means a feudal lord, not Lord God.

V. The context of Jaufre's poem would seem to bear out this conclusion. The poet wishes that somebody might give him an opportunity of seeing his lady; he would not hesitate to call him his lord (ll. 8-9). But he realizes that there is no such person. So the *mas* that starts l. 10 is of deep meaning because, much good as his love may give him, the fact that the lady is unattainable for him fills him with double grief (ll. 10-11). Suddenly, the idea strikes him that he does not need anybody to help him, that he could go to see his lady all by himself, clad in a pilgrim's garment (ll. 12-14). But that dream, too, fades away; he gives up his plan, resigning himself to the will of God (l. 28):

Mas tot sia cum a Dieu platz!

In stanza VI, he again turns to God, in a most solemn way:

<sup>13</sup> *Jaufre Rudels . . . enamoret se de la comtessa de Tripol, ses vezzer, per lo ben qu'el n'auzi dire als pelegrins que venguen d'Antiocha* (Jeanroy's edition, p. 21).

<sup>14</sup> Cf., ll. 12-14 of Jaufre's poem quoted above: *Ai! car me fos lai pelegrin, Si que mos fustz e mos tapis Fos pels sieus belhs hielhs remiratz!*

- Dieus que fetz tot quant ve ni vai  
 36. e formet sest'amor de lonh  
 mi don poder, que cor ieu n'ai,  
 38. qu'eu vey a sest'amor de lonh.

This is indeed one of those passages in which the troubadours connect God's name with their love affairs and of which we gave examples from troubadours of the oldest generation.<sup>15</sup> If the two lines which occupy us here (ll. 8-9) belonged to the same kind of *topos* — if we may call it that — Jaufre would have used it twice in the same poem. This is another argument against identifying the *senhor* of l. 8 with God.

VI. The syntactical construction of our passage should, in my opinion, be likewise viewed differently from the way it has been done until now.

(1) *tenc* (l. 8). The verb *tener*, where it means "to regard as, to consider," is constructed with a direct object joined by a predicative noun (or adjective) in the same case or preceded by one of the prepositions *a*, *en*, or *per*.<sup>16</sup> All the editors recognize in our text the last-mentioned construction, connecting *per veray* with *tenc*. I prefer seeing in *per veray* an expression synonymous with the frequent phrase *per ver* "in accordance with truth, truly."

(2) *lo* (l. 8). This is, in my opinion, the accusative of the personal pronoun ("him"), not the definite article. According to Schultz-Gora,<sup>17</sup> the inversion of the object pronoun generally occurs in case the sentence is introduced by *et* or in the beginning of a principal clause which is preceded by a subordinate one. Here are two examples of such an inversion in which neither case is involved. They are both taken from a poem by Raimon de Miraval, P.-C. 406, 9 (ed. Kolsen, *Beiträge* No. 23):

Puois membra·m cum s'afortis  
 dompna cui bos pretz noiris.

IV, 1.

C'apres ve·il bona razos,  
 et es dreitz que·l vers venssa.

IV, 8.

3. *per qu'ieu veirai* (l. 9). The phrase *per que* is to be referred to the *lo* ("him") in l. 8. This *lo*, then, has the nature of a determina-

<sup>15</sup> See chapter II and note 6.

<sup>16</sup> See Levy, *Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch* VIII, pp. 148-50.

<sup>17</sup> *Altprovenzalisches Elementarbuch*, 5th ed., Heidelberg, 1936, § 208.

tive pronoun. I have only one other example of that construction at hand. It is from Lanfranc Cigala P.-C. 282, 19 (ed. Branciforti No. VII), VI, 4:

Qu'aissi chantan sai la celadamen  
cubrir, *don* nais mos jois ni m'entendenza.

If this example is not deemed a sufficient proof for the existence of a Provençal construction of the same kind because it stems from an Italian troubadour, the relative pronoun *que*, in the phrase *per qu'ieu*, may be regarded as having no antecedent at all. The following three examples would form exact parallels to our text: a relative pronoun representing a person, preceded by a preposition, and having no antecedent:

E s'ambedui eron ab ellas,<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> *Ambedui* = Guillem's squires; *ellas* = Flamenca's girl companions.  
aurion *ab* cui si deportesson.

Flamenca (ed. Paul Meyer, 1<sup>st</sup> ed.), l. 6435.

Totz autre joys es niens  
*encontra* qui vos jauzia.

Ber. de Palazol P.-C. 47, 7 (ed. Appel, *Prov.*  
*Inedita*, p. 10) III, 10.

Pero anc non lai vic  
paupre cusso mendic  
sezer *latz* qui son ric.<sup>19</sup>

Peire Cardenal P.-C. 335, 31 (ed. Appel, *Chrest.*  
No. 76) IV, 11.

VII. To sum up, this is the text of our two lines as I think it should be read:

Be tenc lo senhor per veray  
per qu'ieu veirai l'amor de lonh,

and this its translation: "I certainly regard him as lord in all sincerity through whom I shall see the far-away love."

New York City

KURT LEWENT

<sup>19</sup> Lavaud, in his edition of that poet (Toulouse, 1957), reads: *sezen las cusson ric*.



## Addenda to the Sources of Corneille's *L'Illusion comique*

The little tragedy in Act V of Corneille's *L'Illusion comique* consists, for the most part, of two dialogues. In the first, a wife Hippolyte attempts to prevent her husband Théagène from keeping a tryst with the Princess Rosine. In the second dialogue Théagène, having been converted to the cause of marital fidelity, meets Rosine and tries to calm her illicit passion with appeals to morality. Robert Garapon, in his edition of the play, published toward the end of 1957, cited two sources for these scenes: for scene 3, Hardy's *Alcméon*, II, 2, and III, 2; and for scene 4, Rotrou's *Cléagénor et Doristée*, IV, 3.<sup>1</sup> In an article written before this edition was available but published several months afterwards, I showed that the first of these dialogues contains seven instances of borrowing from the *Medea* of Euripides and suggested that Corneille was parodying his own *Médée*.<sup>2</sup> Since, as Riddle indicated long ago, Corneille apparently made use of *Alcméon* for two innovations in *Médée*,<sup>3</sup> the parodistic interpretation still seems tenable. There is, however, a third source for this first dialogue: *Cléagénor et Doristée*, which, as noted above, is also a source for the second dialogue.

In *L'Illusion comique*, V, 3, Hippolyte gives three arguments against Théagène's proposed liaison with the Princess: (1) ll. 1407-1432,<sup>4</sup> his obligations to her, his loving wife; (2) ll. 1463-1484, his debt to the Prince, his friend and protector; and (3) ll. 1513-1540, the risk he runs of eventually being killed by the Prince. After Théagène has countered the last of these arguments (with the contention that his love has rendered him incapable of following a reasonable course), Hippolyte announces her intention to commit suicide, whereupon

<sup>1</sup> Robert Garapon, "Introduction" to his edition of Corneille's *L'Illusion comique* (Paris, 1957), pp. xxxvi-xxxix.

<sup>2</sup> A. Donald Sellstrom, "*L'Illusion comique* of Corneille: The Tragic Scenes of Act V," *MLN*, LXXIII (1958), 421-427.

<sup>3</sup> Lawrence M. Riddle, *The Genesis and Sources of Pierre Corneille's Tragedies from "Médée" to "Pertharite"*, Johns Hopkins Stud. in Lang. and Lit., Vol. III (Baltimore, 1926), pp. 3-6. The two innovations mentioned by Riddle as paralleling parts of *Alcméon* are: the appearance of Créuse on stage, and her covetous desire for Médée's fabulous robe (whereas in other versions she accepts it as a gift offered by Medea in return for protection of her children). Jason's intention to kill the children himself may also have been suggested by *Alcméon*, where the hero actually kills his children in a mad rage brought on by his rejected wife's magic ring, which her rival has asked him to get.

<sup>4</sup> Line numbers refer to the text in M. Garapon's edition of the play.

Théagène is finally won over. A somewhat similar situation exists at one point in *Cléagénor et Doristée*. (An incredible number of situations occur in this play, where the heroine is abducted twice, forced to join a band of thieves, and pursued by four men and, when disguised as a page, by two women.) Théandre, husband of Dorante, has conceived an irresistible passion for Doristée and enlists the aid of a friend in making her believe her fiancé Cléagénor has been killed. In Act V, scene 3,<sup>5</sup> the friend begins to question the wisdom of Théandre's actions. Specifically, Théandre is pressed to take three things into account: (1) his love for his wife, (2) the risk of one day having to fight a duel with his friend Cléagénor, and (3) the shame that will attach to betraying a friend, by trying to steal away his mistress. Like his counterpart in *L'Illusion comique*, Théandre acknowledges the force of these arguments but, claiming to be powerless, persists in his foolhardy and immoral pursuit. Théandre's wife Dorante had earlier in the play been surprised by him in the act of trying to seduce the reluctant and disguised Doristée. (This is the scene which Corneille used for the second of the tragic dialogues.) For this reason, she could hardly have advanced these arguments herself, as the devoted Hippolyte can and does do in *L'Illusion*. Just after Théandre's friend has exhausted all rational objections to the liaison, Dorante does come upon the scene, though, and full of repentance (partially feigned) offers to kill herself in order to set her husband free. Although three characters are involved in Rotrou as against two in Corneille, it is clear nevertheless that Corneille has used *Cléagénor et Doristée*, as well as Hardy's *Alcméon* and Euripides' *Medea*, for the first dialogue of the tragedy in Act V of *L'Illusion comique*.

As mentioned above, the scene where the wife Dorante tries to seduce the heroine (who is disguised as a page) is the source of Corneille's *second* dialogue, between Théagène and Rosine. This scene in Rotrou's play comes just after another in which the heroine, far from fending off unwelcome advances, merrily—and unsuccessfully—attacks the defenses of Dorante's *suivante*, a warm-blooded girl who is determined to preserve her virtue at least to the altar. Doristée, in other words, is seen arguing first for, then a moment later against, the cause of sexual licence. The same kind of contrast occurs between the two dialogues in *L'Illusion*, where Théagène is first the errant husband, then suddenly the "reformed" lover.

<sup>5</sup> The edition I used does not number the lines: Jean Rotrou, *Œuvres*, [ed. Viollet-le-Duc], (Paris, 1820), Vol. 1.

The pattern of borrowing can be summarized as follows:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (1) <i>L'Illusion comique</i> , V, 3                           | — The <i>Medea</i> of Euripides; <i>Alcméon</i> , II, 2 and III, 2; <i>Cléagénor et Doristée</i> , V, 3 and 4 |
| (2) <i>L'Illusion comique</i> , V, 4                           | — <i>Cléagénor et Doristée</i> , IV, 3  |
| (3) <i>L'Illusion comique</i> : the contrast of scenes 3 and 4 | — <i>Cléagénor et Doristée</i> , IV, 2 and 3  |

In one sense *L'Illusion comique* is the least original of Corneille's plays. Its leading characters—the magician and the braggart soldier—are drawn from the pastoral and the tragi-comic traditions of the day; the plot of the main portion of the play—Acts II, III, and IV—comes, apparently, from an unknown Spanish *comedia*;\* and as we have just seen, two of the principal scenes in Act V are based in part on plays of Euripides, Hardy, and Rotrou. There is evidence, however, to support the contrary view that this is also one of Corneille's most personal works. For, as I pointed out in my earlier article on the play, Alcandre seems to be Corneille's ironic image of himself, and the comedy and tragedy evoked by Alcandre's magic seem to recapitulate Corneille's own career as first a writer of comedies, and then, with *Médée*, a writer of tragedy. If *L'Illusion* is nothing more than a mosaic of themes and types common to the theater of the time, if as Garapon suggests<sup>7</sup> it is an "ouvrage de commande" on which Corneille worked hurriedly and without great personal commitment, then the additional sources cited here need no explanation. They simply point up again the essential derivativeness of the play. Assuming however that Corneille at least to some extent is taking stock of himself and his art in *L'Illusion*, then one must obviously wonder why he borrowed so heavily from *Cléagénor et Doristée*. The reasons for this borrowing are bound to remain uncertain, but two possibilities seem reasonable and plausible to me.

Rotrou's play, with its long and rapid succession of incidents, lacks sound dramatic structure and rather resembles a dramatized picaresque narrative, with a girl instead of the usual boy for protagonist. Corneille, whose own plays already had revealed a sure grasp of the comic, would scarcely have been attracted to *Cléagénor et Doristée* for its specifically dramatic qualities. It is much more likely that he was interested rather in Rotrou's treatment of the complementary themes of fidelity and infidelity. These themes had figured promi-

\* Garapon, pp. xxi-xxx, xxxix-xlii.

<sup>7</sup> Garapon, pp. xliii-xlvii.

nently in his own last two plays, *La Place Royale* and *Médée*. And in developing them, he seems to have encountered a serious problem—the problem of how to retain the dramatic advantages of a rupture caused by infidelity without, as in the case of Alidor and Jason, sacrificing the audience's sympathy for the hero. Act V, scene 4 of *L'Illusion* suggests a solution to this problem in the person of the regenerated Théagène, who abandons his mistress but only because he is forced to do so in order to honor a higher obligation to his wife. As noted above, the idea for this crucial scene was suggested by *Cléagénor et Doristée*. Rotrou's play, with its plethora of amorous incidents, seems to have contained what for Corneille became the germ of a brilliant paradox whereby later heroes like Rodrigue, Horace, and Polyucte, as well as Théagène, could be simultaneously guilty and innocent of "la honte du change."

However far-reaching the results of the borrowing from Rotrou, Corneille's interest may, at least initially, have been excited by something much more prosaic. In Act III, scene 2 of *Cléagénor et Doristée*, Dorante and her waiting maid Diane are seen vying for the affections of the disguised heroine Doristée. In order to be rid of the maid and to have the "page" to herself, Dorante fabricates three successive errands for Diane, who in turn complains bitterly of her sad lot. The mistress' trick and the maid's resentful feelings parallel almost exactly a situation which Corneille had developed at much greater length in his own comedy *La Suivante*.<sup>8</sup> Since imitation is a form of flattery, Corneille's borrowing from Rotrou may possibly have been motivated also by a generous desire to repay a compliment.

University of Texas

A. DONALD SELLSTROM

## Grimm et les Nouvelles Littéraires de Raynal

La question des débuts de la *Correspondance littéraire* de Grimm n'a jamais été réglée d'une manière définitive. On s'est longtemps contenté de répéter après Meister que la *Correspondance littéraire* est

<sup>8</sup> See *La Suivante*, II, 4. Diane's complaints about the lot of a *souvante* come at the end of Act III, scene 3; though barely four lines long they express the same attitudes developed at much greater length in Amarante's stances at the end of Corneille's play.—Lancaster, in his *History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore, 1929), Pt. I, vol. II, 599 and 494, gives the following probable dates for the first performance of the plays: *La Suivante*, 1632-33; *Cléagénor et Doristée*, 1634.

simplement la suite des *Nouvelles littéraires* de Raynal qui a lui-même fourni à Grimm ses premiers abonnés. La publication simultanée des deux œuvres par Tourneux, en 1877, n'a fait que renforcer cette impression.

Certains faits connus de la vie de Grimm et de Raynal favorisent une telle interprétation. Nous savons que non seulement Grimm avait eu l'occasion de lire les *Nouvelles littéraires* de Raynal avant son arrivée en France en février 1749, mais aussi que les deux hommes devinrent rapidement amis à Paris où le critique allemand a pu connaître l'œuvre de l'abbé français, avant même les débuts de la *Correspondance littéraire* en mai 1753. Nous possédons enfin le témoignage de Meister: "C'est à l'intérêt de cette liaison, écrit-il, que Grimm dut l'offre que lui fit l'abbé de lui céder sa *Correspondance littéraire* avec quelques cours du Nord et du Midi de l'Allemagne."<sup>1</sup> L'assertion de Meister semble être d'autant plus juste qu'on n'a pu, jusqu'à présent, retrouver que les numéros du 29 juillet 1747 au 27 décembre 1751 et du 1<sup>er</sup> avril 1754 au 15 février 1755 des *Nouvelles littéraires*. D'où l'on conclut que Raynal, surchargé d'ouvrage, avait cédé sa charge de critique littéraire à Grimm pendant quelque temps, pour tenter plus tard de reprendre son ouvrage. Ce dernier essai fut d'ailleurs vite abandonné car, explique Meister, Grimm, "grâce à la finesse de son tact et de son goût, grâce encore à ses rapports avec plusieurs hommes de lettres de la première distinction, répandu comme il l'était dans les meilleures sociétés de Paris, parvint bientôt à donner à cette gazette littéraire plus d'importance et plus d'intérêt qu'elle n'en avait jamais eu."<sup>2</sup>

Telle est la théorie encore généralement acceptée concernant le début de la *Correspondance littéraire* et les rapports entre Grimm et Raynal. Il y a pourtant plusieurs difficultés à admettre une telle opinion. En premier lieu, on ignore quels ont pu être, hors la duchesse de Saxe-Gotha, les abonnés de Raynal. Meister seul nous dit qu'il y en a eu d'autres. Mais Meister, en 1753, demeurait encore en Suisse et n'avait que neuf ans. Il ne rapporte donc que ce qui lui a été dit par un autre. Et l'on sait que Meister, dans sa vieillesse, avait une étrange faculté de déformer les faits, ou d'en fabriquer entièrement.<sup>3</sup> Ses dires seuls, qui ne sont appuyés sur aucun fait certain, ne peuvent faire autorité.

Par contre, le biographe de l'abbé Raynal, M. Anatole Feugère, ne

<sup>1</sup> *Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique par Grimm, Diderot, Raynal, Meister, etc.*, éd. Tourneux (Paris, 1877-1882), I, 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 234-236.

mentionne que l'abonnement de la duchesse de Saxe-Gotha aux *Nouvelles littéraires*.<sup>4</sup> De plus, d'après la correspondance privée entre celle-ci et le baron de Thun concernant les appointements de Raynal, il semblerait que la duchesse n'a point voulu partager avec d'autres le travail de son correspondant. En juillet 1747, elle destinait en effet 200 livres à celui-ci.<sup>5</sup> Le baron de Thun lui écrivit cependant que Raynal "m'a dit qu'il lui était impossible de continuer pour les 200 livres. Qu'il lui faudrait ou une augmentation ou d'autres personnes qui lui donnassent chacun 400 livres. Il me semble que cela ne seroit pas difficile à trouver dans les cours ou villes voisines de Gotha."<sup>6</sup> Après quelque hésitation, la duchesse se décida à donner 400 livres par an à Raynal,<sup>7</sup> et il n'est plus question, dans sa correspondance avec de Thun, de partager les *Nouvelles littéraires* avec d'autres. Cet incident ferait croire que Raynal a écrit ses *Nouvelles littéraires* pour la duchesse de Saxe-Gotha seule. Mme von der Osten conclut dans sa biographie de la duchesse: "Beide Unternehmungen haben also eine Zeit lang nebeneinander bestanden, nur scheint es, dass Raynal allein für die Herzogin von Gotha geschrieben habe, während Grimm stets eine grössere Zahl von Abonnenten hatte, zu denen sich die Herzogin von Gotha erst 1754 gesellte."<sup>8</sup>

Mais si la duchesse de Saxe-Gotha fut la seule abonnée de Raynal, Grimm a dû se trouver lui-même ses premiers correspondants, puisque la duchesse ne s'abonna à la *Correspondance littéraire* qu'en avril 1754.<sup>9</sup> On ne connaît aucun des correspondants de Grimm pour l'année 1753. Ce serait une étrange coïncidence que, Grimm ayant poursuivi sa correspondance avec plusieurs des anciens abonnés de Raynal, personne n'ait pu trouver la trace de ces premiers souscripteurs. Il semble plus probable que Grimm a commencé sa carrière de critique littéraire avec un seul, ou peut-être deux abonnés qu'il a pu trouver lui-même dans un voyage qu'il fit en Allemagne au début de l'année 1753.<sup>10</sup> Les abonnés que, selon Meister, Raynal a transférés à Grimm semblent n'avoir jamais existé.

Voici une autre difficulté: Raynal a-t-il vraiment interrompu son travail entre le 27 décembre 1751 et le 1<sup>er</sup> avril 1754? On le croit

<sup>4</sup> Anatole Feugère, *Bibliographie critique de l'abbé Raynal* (Angoulême, 1922), p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Jenny von der Osten, *Luise Dorothee, Herzogin von Sachsen-Gotha* (Leipzig, 1893), p. 80.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 81.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 82.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83.

<sup>9</sup> *Correspondance littéraire*, xvi, 434.

<sup>10</sup> Th. W. Danzel, *Gottsched und seine Zeit* (Leipzig, 1855), p. 352.



généralement, faute de n'avoir jamais retrouvé les numéros manquants des *Nouvelles littéraires*. Nous n'avons cependant aucune preuve positive de ce fait. Peut-être les feuilles qui manquent ont-elles été simplement égarées avant leur publication au siècle dernier. Certes, rien n'indique dans le numéro du 27 décembre 1751 que le critique voulait alors abandonner son travail. Et les *Nouvelles littéraires* du 1<sup>er</sup> avril 1754 ne contiennent aucune marque d'une interruption de la correspondance. Mais alors, si Raynal n'a pas abandonné son ouvrage, Grimm n'a pu lui succéder.

Dans le cas contraire, une autre difficulté se pose: Si Raynal a vraiment interrompu les *Nouvelles littéraires* entre le 27 décembre 1751 et le 1<sup>er</sup> avril 1754, comment a-t-il pu, en mai 1753, c'est-à-dire un an et demi après, transférer sa correspondance à Grimm? Il semblerait que la place aurait été prise par un autre pendant ce temps. Faudrait-il croire alors que Raynal n'a interrompu l'envoi des *Nouvelles littéraires* que de mai 1753 à avril 1754? Ce serait étrange, et cette théorie serait encore plus difficile à prouver que l'autre.

Plusieurs faits généralement admis concernant les débuts de la *Correspondance littéraire* sont bien incertains, nous l'avons vu, et présentent des difficultés presque insolubles. Nous avons remarqué aussi que le témoignage de Meister, lorsqu'il n'est appuyé sur aucun fait certain, n'est pas toujours digne de foi. Sans justification, il a jugé que les rapports entre Grimm et Raynal étaient de même nature que ses propres relations avec Grimm. Les faits présentés jusqu'ici nous portent à formuler l'hypothèse que l'œuvre de Grimm est totalement indépendante de celle de Raynal. Toute autre solution présente de trop graves difficultés pour être admise sans autre preuve que le témoignage de Meister. Pour établir d'une manière définitive les rapports entre les *Nouvelles littéraires* de Raynal et la *Correspondance littéraire* de Grimm, il faudra sans doute attendre encore que de nouvelles découvertes nous fournissent des preuves positives en cette matière.

University of Illinois

JEANNE R. MONTY

## REVIEWS

**P. Ambros-Widmer, *Das Personalpronomen im Bündnerromanischen in phonetischer und morphologischer Schau* (Bern: A. Francke Verlag, 1959. 190 pp. 8 plates. Romanica Helvetica, 67).** THIS book is essentially a complete inventory of the forms of the personal pronoun in Rhetoromance. The author gives an exhaustive list of the subject pronouns which is followed by a similar listing of object pronouns. Within each group the pronouns are arranged by persons. The latter category is again subdivided into stressed forms and unstressed forms. The unstressed forms are arranged according to proclitic or enclitic use. The author has, quite conscientiously, utilized many available sources: old and modern documents, grammars, dialect studies, the AIS, the *Dicziunari rumantschgrischun*. To these he has added some investigations of his own, results he obtained from sending a questionnaire to selected individuals.

There is little doubt that the author's systematic coverage makes a valuable contribution to Romance studies. At the same time, his very system is open to serious questions and objections: His study does not show the pronominal system of any one dialect area. The organization follows rather strictly the Latin pattern (Thus *tu* used as an object pronoun is discussed under the heading of subject pronouns, p. 56). Another slightly questionable procedure is the attempt to reconstruct phonological evolutions by arranging different forms coexisting presently in different dialects as chronological chains: A development *tu* > *tü* > *ti* > *tij* > *tey* > *toy* > *tay* (p. 11)—each exemplified by a different dialect—seems plausible enough; but to posit it as a historical development without considering the total evolution of the phonological system in which it presumably occurred, seems rather risky.

It is also somewhat disappointing that the author refrains almost completely from drawing general Romance implications and comparisons. In some cases such parallels may lead to different interpretations of his data. Thus the author argues that the reflex *i* rather than *e* for Vulgar latin *e* (from Classical latin *i*) in the neuter pronoun *ilg*, *igl* (< *illūm* or *illūd*) or in the masculine plural *ilg*, *igl* (< *illi*) is due to to proclitic use (C. F. *e* > *i* in *meliorare* > *migliurar*). As proof for his contention he quotes a neuter form *elg* which is attested in the old

Engadin documents and which seems to show that the original development was *illum* > \**ellum* > *elg*, in other words *e* > *e* and not *e* > *i*. But the form *elg* found in one dialect does not necessarily prove that *elg* is the basis of the *ilg* form in another dialect area. In view of the rather frequent vowel metaphony which appears in the neuter forms in Southern Italy or Portuguese one cannot but wonder whether the author dismisses too lightly the possibility that the *i* of the *ilg ilg* forms is due to metaphony caused by *ī* and *ū*.

The appendix of the book contains maps showing the modern reflexes of *ego*, *mihi*, *me*, *te*, *tu*, the neuter pronouns (*illum*, *illud*), and *nos*, *vos*. These maps are extremely helpful in orienting the reader in the rather large number of details and facts presented in this interesting volume.

University of Michigan

ROBERT L. POLITZER

***Sturlunga Saga Manuscript No. 122 A Fol. in the Arnarnagaeae Collection.*** Edited by Jakob Benediktsson, Ph.D. (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1959. 18 + 109 v + 3 facsimile pp. S 103, —. **Early Icelandic Manuscripts in Facsimile. First Volume. General Editor Jón Helgason**). THIS is the first of a series of fourteen folio volumes of early Icelandic manuscripts to be brought out by the international publishers in Copenhagen, Rosenkilde and Bagger, with Jón Helgason, Professor and Director of the Arnarnagaeae Collection serving as a general editor. An astounding fact about these editions, demonstrated by the two photographs of p. 46v., is that the photographed edition is usually much more legible than the original manuscript. This is due to the modern methods of flooding the manuscripts with ultraviolet and infrared light, employed by the photographer Detective Sergeant Johan A. Jensen. The difference is extraordinary, and it is no exaggeration to say that scholars have never had texts so easy to read, for these facsimiles are much better than the originals themselves.

In the introduction the editor gives a brief history and description of the manuscript. In this he partly follows Kålund, who made a diplomatic edition of the manuscript 1906-11; he can partly improve on Kålund, because every leaf had to be taken from the binding for this edition; on the other hand he also can see that several of the letters, read by Kålund, have now crumbled away. This manuscript

is written in four different hands; the scribes all differ in penmanship and orthography. Some of these hands seem experienced scribes and are found in other manuscripts. But hand one is an obvious tyro, his orthography is full of the strangest mistakes, and Didrik Arup Seip claims in *Nye studier i norsk språkhistorie* (Oslo, 1954) that these mistakes are often Norwegianisms, and must be due to the fact that this manuscript of *Sturlunga* was copied from a Norwegian manuscript. Now *Sturlunga* was first compiled ca. 1300 and the present manuscript dates from ca. 1350. Jakob Benediktsson claims that this would be a rather short time for the book to be copied back and forth to and from Norway, even if there was interest there in Icelandic sagas and history which he doubts. He, therefore, feels that this was of general Norwegian interest, which certainly could be expected to be great at this time when both lay and learned (the bishops) offices in Iceland were filled with Norwegians. To prove his point Jakob Benediktsson lists several similar errors from other indubitably Icelandic manuscripts and quotes Kuhn in *APhSc* 1952, xxii, 65-80 and Jón Helgason in the Introduction to *Manuscripta Islandica*, 1957, iv, pp. xx-xxiv to the same effect.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

**Holger Olof Nygard, *The Ballad of Heer Halewijn, Its Forms and Variations in Western Europe. A Study of the History and Nature of a Ballad Tradition* (Knoxville: The Univ. of Tennessee Press, 1958. 350 pp.).** THIS is an extremely learned and critical monograph on the ballad of *Heer Halewijn* and its European and American variants, first in Flanders, Holland, and Germany (*Ulinger* and *Ulrich*), then in Scandinavia: Denmark (*Kvindemorderen*), Sweden, Norway, and Iceland (*Ása gekk um stræti*), then in France and French-Canada (*Renaud, le Tueur de Femmes*) and finally, in England, Scotland, Ireland, and America (*Lady Isabel and the Elfknight*).

The book begins with an introduction, dealing critically with methods and source-hunting, especially as applied to the Scottish ballad *Lady Isabel and the Elfknight*. There follow chapters on the ballad in each of its geographical territories, with maps illustrating its occurrence in these countries, with a full listing of all variants, and with a schematic drawing illustrating the relationship of the variants in each country. The only thing which is missing from this

study is the music. The chapter on Great Britain is in two sections, the second is on the A and B variants with animadversions upon Peter Buchan; Nygard considers the A variant to be a forgery perpetrated by someone in P. Buchan's circle, and he has not many kind words to say about P. Buchan, any more than the great Professor Child himself. Nygard shows that it was due to the nationalistic spirit of Scotland that ballads were seemingly better represented there than in England—not least so in the case of this ballad which scholars consequently moved from Scandinavia to Scotland, and therefrom to England and France. But Nygard shows conclusively that the movement of the Ballad was from Flanders to France and to England and Scotland while the rest of the ballads' spread was from Holland to Germany and to Scandinavia, including Iceland. This he sets forth in his last chapter giving his conclusions.

One of his conclusions, given earlier in the course of his study is the observation that the beginning and the end of the ballad are not as stable as its middle parts. The beginning of the ballad is found in Holland and Iceland but not in the rest of the Scandinavian material. It is the song (perhaps magical) by which the criminal entices the lady to him. The *fögur læti* can remind of the *fögr var sjá kveðandi at heyra* which, in *Laxdæla saga* is used about the chanting of magic songs of *seiðr*; cf. also *seðlæti*.

While we are on the subject of the Icelandic ballad it may be mentioned that Mr. Nygard lists my article on popular poetry in Malone's *Philologica*, but not the translation of it in *Skírnir* 1949. I wish I had had Mr. Nygard's book when I was writing my article for Fernand Mossé's memorial volume (still to appear) on the ballad motif: "Lai þi heved in my lap," taken from the Middle English *Judas* ballad, for it is the same motif as his "delousing motif" found in the German and Scandinavian (not Icelandic) variants of his ballad. I found it in some of the sagas, apart from examples in English ballads. Since then I have come across one more instance in Carl Rosenberg's *Nordboernes Aandsliv fra Oldtiden til vore Dage*, 1878-85, vol. III, 586. A wooer asks his future bride: *Gören mig så mycket till wiljes, at I welen löska mig*. She became the mother of the greatest hymnist in Sweden.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

**Didrik Arup Seip, *Norsk språkhistorie til omkring 1317*. 2. utg. (Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co., 1955. xviii + 394 pp).** THIS is a fine history of the Old Norwegian language, written by a man who has devoted a lifetime to a study of the matter, as well as to Old Norse palaeography of which he has also written a standard work for *Nordisk Kultur*. The book starts, conventionally enough, with a list of the I. E. languages and a sketch of the Germanic dialects of which Old Norse is one. Follows a treatment of Primitive Old Norse up to the sixth century on the basis of place names, names in classical authors, loanwords in Lappish and Finnish and the runic inscriptions, the origin of which is still in dispute (latest theory by Erik Moltke: Denmark, first or second century A. D.). There follows the time of umlaut breaking (mutation, fracture) and syncope, which now is placed definitely before the Viking period (800-1050), due, especially to the Eggjum stone of ca. 700, which may be compared to the earliest Old English writings of 700, in which umlaut and syncope also has taken place. Formerly scholars thought that the great acceleration of tempo of speech causing the syncope was due to the new and exhilarating experiences of the Viking age. But the monuments both in England and Scandinavia, at least Norway, speak against this plausible, though probably romantic, theory.

Chapter six deals with the coming of the Latin alphabet and with the earliest period of Old Norwegian 1050-1150, but does not neglect the evidence of the contemporary runes, though that evidence is now a trickle compared with the stream of books or manuscripts. Chapter seven describes the standards or rather norms of writing developing first in Trondheim, then in Bergen 1150-1300. The final and eighth chapter treats the linguistic norm which developed in Oslo of the East, the bridge between Old and Middle Norwegian 1300-1370.

Unlike Icelandic, a daughter dialect, Norwegian is characterized by vowel harmony and vowel balance. Unlike the umlaut-mutation, which is a regressive assimilation of rootvowel by endvowel, vowel harmony is a progressive assimilation of endvowel by rootvowel (*erill* > *erell*). Vowel balance is a weakening of endvowel after a long syllable only (*fúla* > *fúlæ*, but *fara* unchanged). Being on the subject of long and short syllables we might take a look at Seip's definition of quantity on p. 109, for we find here a strange omission, the only one I have been able to detect in this extremely systematic and seemingly full book. Seip describes long syllables like all grammarians: a long syllable is made up of long vowel or diphthong plus one short con-



sonant, *hús*, *kleif*, *bita*, or of a short vowel (diphthong) plus two or more consonants, *fjall*, *land*, *padda*, *senda*, finally, if overlong, it is made up of a long vowel plus two or more consonants, *nátt*, *breitt*, *síld*, *freista*. The short syllable Seip also describes in a conventional way as far as his description goes: his short syllable is made up of a short vowel (or diphthong) plus one short consonant, *fat*, *vit*, *fara*, *lifa*. But here is the omission. Seip does not mention syllables made up of one long vowel or one short vowel, which according to most grammarians including the *Altmeisters* Noreen and Pipping are short, *búa*, *bú*, *sá*, *bjó*, *í*, *vé*. That syllables with a long vowel actually are short can be seen by such examples as *dýja* pret. *dúða*, like *telja* : *talða* with short rootsyllable and unlike *heyra* : *heyrða* with long. The same rule of length and shortness in syllables holds both in Old English and in Gothic, but some German Edda editors have not understood this when they printed forms like *bua*, *snua* instead of *búa*, *snúa* confusing vowel with syllable length. So this is a rather bad omission, but who am I to find fault, as I am sure careful readers would find similar omissions in my Icelandic textbooks. And if Seip on p. 14 does not mention my article on runic *harabanaR*, in which I tried to prove that this spelling would be possible only if *h* still retained its original quality of the Germanic *ach*-sound, that is of little importance. But I feel that Seip's discussion of the svarabhakti vowel (p. 137) is extremely important and illuminating; likewise his chapters on assimilation, but especially the ones on differentiation (p. 149 and 289) and added (intrusive) consonants (p. 183) which he also describes as addition of consonants by segmentation and differentiation. As far as I can see the grammarians of Middle English could learn a good deal from these chapters to explain the wild linguistic shoots of Middle English. On p. 30 they will find an explanation of the strange *-s* in their third person singular for the original *-þ*.

I hope I have said enough of this important work to prove that it should be a *desideratum*, not only for Scandinavian, but also for Middle English grammarians, a work that in spite of a few *lapsus calami* truly praises its master.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

STEFAN EINARSSON

Paul Schach and Lee M. Hollander, trans., *Eyrbyggja Saga* (Lincoln: The Univ. of Nebraska Press, and The American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1959. xx + 140 pp. \$4.25). THE American-Scan-

dinavian Foundation has added another of the longer Icelandic sagas to its roster of publications: *Eyrbyggja saga*. The translation of the prose is done by Professor Paul Schach of the University of Nebraska who in recent years has devoted himself to Icelandic studies and is, for the present, editing the romantic *Tristrams saga*. I have sampled the translation and found no errors in it. This was to be expected as the translator took the unusual trouble to go to the National Library in Iceland to check and complete his work. He even went to Snæfellsnes, visiting the scene of the saga, seeing Helgafell (The Holy Mountain) with his own eyes, but the Icelandic weather god was against him and brought home to him the reality of his note on p. 107.

The saga reads well, the style is simple and straightforward: more faithful to the classical quality of the original than the romantic and dialectal style of William Morris and Eiríkur Magnússon, whose translation of the saga was published in their Saga Library. The style of the original is unusually distinctive and original as the translator has shown in some articles on the saga. In some cases there are alliterative phrases which the translator has imitated, but always making a remark on that in his notes. The notes are footnotes and unusually extensive for a translation; but they are very useful in a saga of this kind, full of antiquarianisms, folklore, and folktales.

The verses have been done by Lee M. Hollander the only American scholar adept enough to wield the skaldic meters and diction. The verses of this saga are by no means easy to understand let alone to translate, but as usual, Hollander is undaunted by difficulties, and I do not know whether his scaldic imitations are any harder to understand than some modern poetry; both would need commentaries. Hollander does explain his kennings in the footnotes.

Hollander has also written the introduction. It is very good, highlighting the antiquarian interests, the first-rate storytelling and the fine character drawing of the saga. Hollander even tells us that though the saga is usually considered to be a collection of episodes loosely knit together without a plot, thus being inferior to the great plotted sagas like *Egils saga* and *Njáls saga*, he has come to the conclusion that the arrangement of the episodes was deliberately undertaken by the author.

Translators and publishers are to be warmly congratulated on this addition to the American Saga Library.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

STEFAN EINARSSON

M. T. Jones-Davies, *Un Peintre de la vie londonienne: Thomas Dekker*, 2 vols. (Paris: Marcel Didier, 1958. vol. I: 415 pp., 6 plates, 4 maps; vol. II: 478 pp., 4 plates. Collection des Etudes Anglaises, 6). SOME Elizabethan dramatists are still neglected. Of these the amiable Dekker has, surprisingly, been one; but reparation is at last being made, and in no uncertain fashion. The splendid Bowers edition, the first since the appalling Shepherd reprint of 1874, continues its stately progress. And now, half a century after M. L. Hunt's unsatisfactory *Thomas Dekker*, comes Mme Jones-Davies's enormous study: 7 years in preparation, 900 pages, a large fold-out map of Elizabethan London, 2,912 footnotes, some 400,000 words.

This *Dekker* takes its place as the most ambitious effort to date in the notable series of post-war French doctoral theses that includes Jacquot's *Chapman*, Davril's *Ford*, Axelrad's *Marston*, Carrère's *Kyd*, and Grivelet's *Heywood*. Mme Jones-Davies's book, like its predecessors, is the product of a system in which emphasis is placed less upon the student's original research contribution than upon his assimilation of all the material on a broad subject. Hence the vastness of these "primary theses," with a consequent submergence of the author's own insights and findings; hence the tripartite division (the legacy of Taine) into biography, historical and social backgrounds, and aesthetic evaluation. The finished product is thus synthesis rather than thesis. It is the result of years of labor during which any discoveries made by the degree candidate are not permitted to appear: his work must be "new" upon publication. In the studies produced under so rigorous and constraining a discipline, one cannot reasonably expect the warmth of enthusiasm. The extraordinary thing about Mme Jones-Davies's book is that it is, in fact, a labor of love.

She loves in equal measure her subject — surely one of the most attractive of writers — and the great city in which he lived, suffered, and created. Her quest is to retrieve a vanished past. "Dans le cadre de la capitale élizabéthaine, jacobéenne, voire caroléenne . . .," Mme Jones-Davies writes in her preface, "j'ai . . . voulu saisir et faire revivre la personnalité vibrante de l'écrivain, telle qu'elle m'apparut à la lecture de ses brochures ou de ses pièces, c'est-à-dire singulièrement attachante et inséparable de Londres." In handling the old maps of Norden and Visscher, she is moved by "ce charme enchanteur des vieilles choses qui font voir le passé" (i. 373), and in Dekker's writings themselves she savors the "parfum d'antan" (i. 189). If she must reluctantly admit that in the London of the twentieth cen-

tury, "l'aspect physique et les mœurs . . . sont moins pittoresques qu'aux environs de 1600," she can nevertheless go on to assert that "l'âme londonienne est aussi ardente que jamais, entre autres, l'avènement d'un souverain excite dans la capitale l'enthousiasme d'autrefois . . ." (i. 368).

This total commitment to her subject sustains Mme Jones-Davies as she threads her way through a dark forest, where facts are few and conjecture always a temptation, to provide as full an account as possible of a life that spanned three reigns. Nothing is too slight for her to linger over. In the rude engravings that adorn the title-pages of some Dekker pamphlets — engravings which quite possibly do not convey the author's likeness — Mme Jones-Davies discerns marks of "la virilité, presque de la rudesse, néanmoins alliées à une indéniable finesse; de la gravité, de la conscience . . ." (i. 74). No doubt it is the scarcity of concrete facts that leads her more than once into dubious conjectures and romantic elaborations. She contrasts, without a hint of irony, the happy partnership of Dekker and Gerrard Christmas with the bitter rivalry of Jonson and Inigo Jones. She suggests (tentatively to be sure) a reconciliation between Jonson and Dekker — combatants in the War of the Theatres — when the two poets assumed the task of celebrating James's entry into London in 1604; this despite the fact that they did not collaborate, and that they published their efforts separately. She muses whether Webster, Dekker's old collaborator, was the intermediary who arranged for the needy poet to contribute to the 1616 edition of Overbury's *Characters*. Of Day she says that he was happy to work with Dekker whenever the occasion offered itself, and of Ford that without doubt he turned to the stage for the first time as the result of Dekker's urgings. Hypothesis is, however, usually presented as such. Mme Jones-Davies has a disarming way of advancing her more fanciful speculations in the form of questions, and she is nowhere more engaging than when she grants that in his writings Dekker "ne révèle rien de ses affaires de cœur" (i. 80).

In her central chapters Mme Jones-Davies provides a staggering account — 250 pages long — of the history, physiognomy, populace, and mores of London. Dekker's own works serve as the chief sources, as the author takes her readers on a guided tour of the streets, monuments, landmarks, etc., recorded by the Bellman of London in his voluminous writings. This picture of the city is in turn minutely compared with other Elizabethan accounts, Mme Jones-Davies's reas-

surings conclusion being that Dekker's version accords in most essentials with those of his contemporaries.

Mme Jones-Davies passes, in the last chapters, to critical commentary and evaluation. The mark of Dekker's originality, she feels, "c'est un ensemble de touches, . . . qui reflètent les âmes multiples du poète — son âme de Londonien ami des humbles, son âme meurtrie et souffrante, compréhensive, tolérante et compatissante, son âme d'observateur, de rieur, d'amuseur et de rêveur, son âme d'optimiste, et son âme de chrétien" (ii. 5). Mme Jones-Davies goes on to discuss Dekker as realist, romantic, humorist, satirist, and moralist; she compares him with (among others) Chaucer, Rabelais, Bunyan, Defoe, Hogarth, Fielding, Goldsmith, Balzac, and, most interestingly, Dickens. In the unequal diversity of the Dekker corpus — an *œuvre* with no discernible pattern of progressive development — she finds one unifying factor: London itself. Dekker narrates a long story of the joys and sorrows of the city; his work — exuberant, poetic, profoundly human — is a comico-serious epic of Troy-Novant.

The appraisal, if hardly novel, is in its general outlines just. One of course takes exception on specific points. Sometimes Mme Jones-Davies claims too much for her hero, as when she suggests that *The Gull's Horn-Book* "anticipe l'ironie swiftienne" (ii. 326), or that *Dekker his Dream* reveals the poet rising "au sommet des plus brillantes splendeurs métaphysiques" (ii. 30). Rose, Lacy, Jane, and Ralph — those delightful but scarcely profound personages of *The Shoemakers' Holiday* — are cited rather surprisingly as evidence that "En explorant le labyrinthe de l'âme humaine, son intuition pénétrante perçoit de ces impondérables, de ces nuances fines, qui donnent aux figures de son théâtre l'individualité d'êtres vivants" (ii. 31). Some of the comparisons, as that with Marlowe in ii. 93, are far-fetched, and surely Mme Jones-Davies is straining after achievements to praise when she claims that, of all the Elizabethans, "Dekker est sans doute le plus excellent . . . portraitiste des cordonniers" (ii. 98).

As a critic Mme Jones-Davies has an old-fashioned sensibility not without a charm of its own. She can be prudish, she sentimentalizes; when she seeks a psychiatric term, she lights upon *dementia praecox*, and uses it as though it were still current. For her, Dekker is always the artist in his smock: he sketches, paints portraits, creates tableaux. Tied to this metaphor, Mme Jones-Davies has little opportunity for analytical criticism, and indeed for her subject she seems to disclaim its possibility (ii. 165). Consequently she underestimates Dekker's at



times masterful stagecraft. Nor does Mme Jones-Davies relate the plays to their theatrical environment. She seems unaware that Dekker's comedies for Paul's boys differ radically from his plays for the adult actors; unfortunately she has missed Alfred Harbage's *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions*.

Mme Jones-Davies sometimes dismisses difficulties too easily. Thus she accepts without question or discussion the identification of Gentili in *The Wonder of a Kingdom* with Edward Alleyn; but see Bentley, *Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, iii, 274. She shies away from the fierce complexities of the Dekker canon: "... nous éviterons de nous perdre dans les controverses stériles qui souvent agitent l'intelligence et l'empêchent de progresser" (ii. 339). But controversy cannot always be avoided, and least of all in studies intended as comprehensive and authoritative. Mme Jones-Davies's simple impressionistic criteria (see i. 90) lead her into an uncritical acceptance of Eberle's shaky argument for Dekker's collaboration in *The Family of Love*. She oversimplifies the issues in the attribution of *Lust's Dominion*. She gives Dekker a partner, where none is needed, in *The Second Part of the Honest Whore*. She solves the problem of *Blurt, Master Constable*—formerly accepted as Middleton's and now thought by some authorities to be Dekker's—by offering a compromise! The comedy is, she suggests, a collaboration: a theory for which she offers no evidence.

If Mme Jones-Davies takes shortcuts with controversies, she gives too much space to repetitions, digressions, and superfluous detail. The reader might have been spared the information that the Shepherd edition of the plays fetched 15 guineas at Blackwell's in 1949, and £16. 2s. at Quaritch's in 1952. He need not be reminded, after three hundred pages of detailed discussion, that Dekker's works are a mine of valuable information about daily life under Elizabeth and James. He does not have to be told at all that Elizabethan schoolmasters knew Latin, that the dramatists found verse an important means of expression, that the audiences did not object to soliloquies. Mme Jones-Davies cannot resist the temptation to digress. When she cites an allusion to the robin in *Villanies Discovered*, she must go on, in a discursive footnote, to give other references to red-breasts in the literature of the period. When she extols London under Elizabeth, she must remind us that other cities have been great: Athens under Pericles, Rome under Augustus, Venice under the Doges, etc., etc. Mme Jones-Davies devotes many pages to such matters as the development of the Elizabethan stage, the rise of formal satire in England, Elizabethan



English, and the development of the "character" as a genre. Most of the information is not strictly necessary, and none of it is new; but Mme Jones-Davies does demonstrate an impressive familiarity with recent scholarship on a variety of subjects.

This reviewer has noticed only a few misprints, but Mme Jones-Davies has not quoted accurately. In a single speech, the Prologue to *If It Be Not Good*, I count 46 errors of transcription in 46 lines (ii.110-11). It is a pity too that she uses Shepherd for the plays. Her practice of citing Dekker's works by the initials of titles is a source of irritation; the reader has 67 abbreviated titles to cope with, and he is not provided with the convenience of an alphabetical listing for reference.

Few, apart from Dekker specialists, will read every word of this very long book. But if the profusion of words about so unassuming a figure seems excessive, one nevertheless admires the affectionate labor that has gone into the making of this study. Mme Jones-Davies is, moreover, enlightening when she chronicles Dekker's fortunes in France. She makes some interesting comparisons between Dekker and French writers, between English rogues and their French counterparts in the earlier seventeenth century, and between Elizabethan "triumphs" and the corresponding "Entrées Solonelles." In sum, Mme Jones-Davies's *Dekker* is an unusual tribute to an engaging dramatist, pamphleteer, and poet of the second rank.

Northwestern University

S. SCHOENBAUM

Burton O. Kurth, *Milton and Christian Heroism. Biblical Epic Themes and Forms in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1959. 152 pp. \$3.00. University of California English Studies, 20). THE importance of this study consists in its demonstration of the unity of *Paradise Lost* as the historical climax of the adaptation of the Christian concept of heroism to the requirements of "a specifically Christian epic" (p. 2). Though Mr. Kurth does not mention Miss Lily Bess Campbell's *Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth Century England*,<sup>1</sup> he is really carrying on her story of the emergence of a new genre of divine poetry under the influence of the Reformation in England. His chapter on Du Bartas links with hers, for both treat Du Bartas

<sup>1</sup> University of California Press, 1959.

as the strongest influence upon poets like Drayton, Aylett, Sabie, and Peyton, who turned to the Bible for epic characters and stories. In Kurth's study three general forms of Biblical narrative are recognized (p. 21)—*discursive*, *allegorical*, and *classical*. Only the last submitted to Virgilian constraint. In the *Divine Weeks* Du Bartas showed the way by abandoning the Virgilian pattern of his early *Judith* for the discursive treatment of an "essentially Protestant compendium of traditionally medieval encyclopedic lore and hexameral exegesis" (p. 43). Cowley's conviction "that strict imitation of classical epic form, particularly in Virgil's *Aeneid*, was the best way to success" (p. 14), does not alter the fact that in the first two books of the *Davideis* he established "the universal setting of the action . . . , drawing upon all the rich cosmic association of the hexameral themes and providing a vision of the coming of Christ" (p. 79). With a protest against criticism of Cowley's design by his own professed Virgilian standards, Kurth sees the *Davideis* as structurally pointing the way to the perfect "fable" of *Paradise Lost*. "At the center of the full range of the cosmic drama" (p. 108) Milton placed the Fall. In proper chronological relation to it, and with proper weight in his whole design, he treated the creation and the apocalyptic vision of human history, culminating in redemption by Christ, "the Hero in the cosmic realm, the Conqueror of an evil summed up in the figure of Satan" (p. 114).

Brevity compels Mr. Kurth to weaken his treatment of the more important discursive Biblical poems like the *Davideis* by ignoring such main features as Cowley's creation song in the account of the School of the Prophets in Rama. Relatively disproportionate space has to be given to treatments of Joseph's temptation by Aylett and Sylvester, of the story of Jonah by Quarles and Boyd, of David's sin with Bathsheba by Sabie and Fuller, and of *Moses His Birth and Miracles* by Drayton. For the benefit of modern readers the unheroic aspects of some of these poems are discussed so as to establish their emphasis upon repentance and obedience as elements in Christian heroism. Within the established limits of space and purpose, however, the summaries of the English discursive poems on Biblical subjects are skilful and adequate, and Kurth does not overstress their glimpses of their heroes' inner conflicts as involved in the cosmic struggle of the Christ of the last book of *Paradise Lost* to bruise the Serpent's head.

In his chapter on "New Testament Narratives" Kurth must deal

with poems like Giles Fletcher's *Christs Victorie and Triumph* and Joseph Beaumont's *Psyche* as diverse examples of mixed allegorical Christian poetry. His approach to the problem by analyzing Vida's *Christiad* is helpful, for the poem is too unfamiliar for most readers to understand Vida's cosmic treatment of the life of Christ. It may seem odd to pay so much attention to him while Tasso is barely mentioned, and the other Italians who are thought to have influenced Milton are ignored. The reader may carry away the impression that Vida was an even more important force in shaping English epic treatments of New Testament subjects than was Du Bartas in the Old Testament field. Nothing is said about the many modern discussions of Italian parallels to all three of Milton's major poems, from Ettore Allodoli's *Giovanni Milton e l'Italia*<sup>2</sup> to F. T. Prince's *The Italian Element in Milton's Verse*,<sup>3</sup> whereas the reader is referred to R. A. Sayce's *The French Biblical Epic*<sup>4</sup> for the context of Du Bartas' *Divines Semaines*.

But the chapter on "New Testament Narratives" is valuable for its opening discussion of a basic distinction "between the figural or symbolic significance of Christ as the supreme example of heroism for the individual soul" (p. 81). The paradox of Christ's divine-human nature is admirably stated as it made him on both levels a cosmic figure and "the ultimate Hero, or measure of heroism" (p. 85). It follows that in a cosmic setting "the need of allegory is minimal, for the conflict is between Christ and Satan, both historical figures" (p. 86). But in a human setting the primarily abstract conceptions of good and evil as motives for action make allegory almost inevitable. These principles are illustrated by the examples of *Christs Victorie*, *Psyche*, and Thomas Robinson's *Life and Death of Mary Magdalene*.

The presentation of Christ as "the Hero in the ultimate sense" (p. 105) throughout *Psyche* is seen as resembling Vida's treatment, while the allegorical portrayal of Psyche's inner conflict in her quest for union with the bridegroom Christ is regarded as stemming from the Spenserian tradition. Nothing is said about Spenser's at least momentarily implied identification of the tempted Christ with the human pilgrim Guyon to whom Mammon offers his mountains of gold on condition that the knight shall "serve" him:

<sup>2</sup> Prato, 1907.

<sup>3</sup> Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1954.

<sup>4</sup> Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955.

Or if to thy great mind, or greedy vew,  
All these may not suffice, there shall to thee  
Ten times so much be nombred francke and free.<sup>5</sup>

Nor is the Spenserian allegorical parallel applied later in the very brief discussion of *Paradise Regained* in Kurth's final chapter on "Milton," though Kurth sees *Psyche* as lying "directly in the line which leads to Milton." Yet he also sees Beaumont's Christ under a "double aspect, both the active principle of good in the cosmic conflict and the guiding principle of Divine Love in the human realm" (p. 101). In the cosmic conflict Beaumont's Christ is a sufficiently actual figure to be described as a proud usurping tyrant by an indomitable and sophisticated Satan, talking to his infernal peers in a council which begins the action of the poem.

The great value of Kurth's entire presentation of the evolving heroic conception of Christ before *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* stems from his perception of the difficulty of artistic portrayal of the three aspects of the Victor in the cosmic drama, the Redeemer in the human realm, and the Exemplar of virtue pitted against evil in the Gospels. In the victory of Christ when Satan tempted him with the offer of the kingdoms of this world Kurth sees not only a "pattern of heroism for the individual," but a solution to the problem of combining "the three types of Biblical subject matter to produce the fullest possible perspective on the relationship of celestial and human events" (p. 108). From this position Kurth can confidently reply to E. R. Curtius' objection<sup>6</sup> that, "Throughout its existence—from Juvenius to Klopstock—the Biblical epic was a hybrid with an inner lack of truth, a *genre faux*." It may not be helpful to fall back upon the metaphor of a "mutation," as Kurth does, but he has made it impossible to regard *Paradise Lost* as "merely the result of artificial cross-breeding of Scripture and pagan epic." In the end our judgment of the historical validity of his definition of heroism will decide whether we can accept *Paradise Lost* and its more important predecessors as having worked out "a distinct form of the heroic genre."

Kurth's definition of Christian heroism begins with Milton's rejection of "the wrath / Of stern Achilles" as an epic theme in the prologue to Book IX of *Paradise Lost* in favor of "the better forti-

<sup>5</sup> *The Faerie Queene*, II, vii, 9, 3-5.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, p. 462, by Kurth on p. 107.

tude / Of Patience and Heroic Martyrdom." A point is shrewdly made by paralleling the Christian view of heroism as resolute choice of virtue and as victorious suffering of martyrs and saints with the "heroic formula of wisdom and courage (*sapientia et fortitudo*) which Curtius has traced as the principal theme of heroism from antiquity to the Renaissance" (p. 27). But in *Paradise Lost* Christ is both sacrificial and conquering hero, and the divine-human paradox of his heroic humiliation for man's sake was both a problem and an opportunity for the poet trying to unify his plot. As Victor in the Battle in Heaven, Creator of a universe, Judge and Advocate of fallen Adam and Eve, and finally as man's suffering Redeemer in Michael's prophecy, Christ becomes both the principle of unity in Milton's plot and "the archetypal heroic figure in *Paradise Lost*" (p. 115). Though a dogmatic Christian faith may be needed to accept the suffering-conquering Christ as the hero of a poem which is structurally unified by its Christology, no theological convictions are necessary for acceptance of Kurth's evidence for the evolution of that Christology as the core of the divine epic poetry of the seventeenth century.

Kurth is content with his historical evidence. He does not try to refine the Miltonic concept as Arnold Stein does in *Heroic Knowledge*,<sup>7</sup> to which he refers only once, and then casually. The design of his study leaves him scant room to treat *Paradise Regained*, and less for *Samson Agonistes*, though he regards the former as "the clearest model of heroic faith and fortitude—'deeds / Above Heroic, though in secret done'" (p. 128). He treats *Samson Agonistes* as "tragic drama, not heroic narrative" (p. 131), but holds that in Samson Milton "probably saw . . . not only a type of Christ but also a human figure representative of both the external and the internal conflict with evil." But the single page devoted to *Samson Agonistes* is far too short to do justice to the drama, which is really outside the scope of Kurth's study.

A final question occurs—perhaps unimportant. On his penultimate page Kurth quotes the famous passage in *Areopagitica* which declares that the man who "can apprehend and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain," is "the true wayfaring Christian." "Wayfaring" is preferred by most editors to the rather well-attested correction of the word as originally printed to

<sup>7</sup> *Heroic Knowledge: An Interpretation of Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957).



"warfaring" in a seventeenth-century hand in several copies of the original edition of the tract. In the modern edition from which the passage is here quoted the corrected reading "warfaring" is used. Has "wayfaring" been unconsciously substituted? Or is it preferred because, of the two great allegories of the Christian pilgrim and the Christian soldier, Kurth would have us believe that Milton preferred the former?

University of Wisconsin

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

William W. Appleton, *Charles Macklin; an actor's life* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1960. vi + 280 pp. \$5.00). THE rugged and peppery personality of Charles Macklin, the savage villainy of his Shylock, his "natural" acting and his opposition to the "hoity-toity tone of the tragedy of that day," his popularity as a tavern oracle and convivialist, his notoriety in the law courts whether as defendant or plaintiff, and the biological accident of his extremely long life have rendered his name, after Garrick's, among the most familiar from the annals of the eighteenth century English stage. And at the same time one of the most neglected. Professor Appleton's book is the first to examine Macklin's life and works under the disciplines of modern scholarship. The last biography was Edward Parry's, published seventy years ago as the final monograph in William Archer's aborted series called *Eminent Actors*. By Parry's own admission it was not much more than a "paste and scissors" book, derived mostly from the immediately post-mortem "Memoirs" of Macklin by Francis Congreve (1798), James Kirkman (1799), and William Cooke (1804).

Professor Appleton has of course examined and criticized the evidence provided by these major witnesses, and has listened again to all the voices from the side-lines — the casual and fragmentary dicta of Garrick, Foote, O'Keeffe, Victor, Lichtenberg, Hill, Wilkinson, Boswell, Bernard, Taylor, and the like. Further, he has had access to valuable manuscript materials, unknown to earlier biographers, including Macklin's Diary (commonplace book) at the Folger Library, several of Macklin's unpublished plays at the Huntington, an extra-illustrated set of Kirkman's *Memoirs* at Harvard, and numerous records at the British Museum, the Enthoven Collection, the Garrick Club, and elsewhere in England and Ireland. The result is a brief and discriminating, though I regret to say not altogether satisfying, record



of Macklin's life. It traces out his early years as a country stroller, his contests with Theophilus Cibber and James Quin at Drury Lane, his murder of Thomas Hallam, his revolutionary triumph as Shylock in 1741, his hostilities with Garrick, his brief and absurd career as a tavern-keeper and master of public oratory, his fracasing in playhouse politics in London and Dublin, his careers as playwright and as teacher of the "science of acting," the great Macbeth riots in 1773 and his successful prosecution of his hecklers, and the climax of his artistic life in 1781 when he created Sir Pertinax Macsycophant in his own masterwork, *The Man of the World*.

We are grateful to Professor Appleton for salvaging many details of Macklin's life, both private and professional, and for sober adjudication between the claims of fact and fiction. He has spiked once and for all the more flagrantly romantic nonsense which has accreted to the Macklin story. Macklin was *not* born in 1690, and he died at the age of 97, not (as Kirkman and Cooke cited old wives' tales to prove) at 107. The famous couplet, "This is the Jew / That Shakespeare drew," was *not* invented by Alexander Pope nor spoken by him from the midst of the pit on the first night of Shylock, nor from a stage box on the third night, nor at a party at Bolingbroke's, nor "in a large company of ladies and gentlemen several years before Macklin's death." Macklin, Garrick, and Peg Woffington did *not* keep a scandalous *ménage à trois* in Bow Street in 1742 or at any other time, as the gossips have had it.

Yet the very scrupulosity of Professor Appleton's approach incurs a certain loss of vitality. I wish the book were nearly twice as long as it is. I wish, indeed, that it were *padded* (to use a hard word) with generous quotation from those unscholarly but loving early biographers, "given in their own language and without paraphrase," as Edward Parry put it. There was a wisdom of taste in Parry's paste and scissors method. For in the late Augustan phrasing of Congreve-Kirkman-Cooke there is a peculiarly delicious flavor which can be captured in no other way than by quotation. When, for instance, we read on the second page that biographer Kirkman "claimed a relationship to Macklin," we may note that Professor Appleton is being cautiously accurate, but we wonder why he has suppressed the fun that lies in Kirkman's insinuation that he was Macklin's bastard. "A near relation," Kirkman calls himself, "bred up, and living for upwards of twenty years with him; acquainted from his infancy with his descent, family, and connections; and enabled by daily observa-

tions to trace out and truly delineate his character." Sir William D'Avenant's smiling silences about his paternity in Shakespeare were not more prettily euphemistical than Kirkman's suggestive phrases. To take another example, it is by all means in order to decide that Macklin's sister Mary never existed (p. 6), but we ought not, in spite of that, to be deprived of Kirkman's account of her pitiful death. When William was about 17 and "Mary" about 18, the story goes, their widowed mother took a second husband, one Luke O'Meally, a Dublin tavern-keeper. O'Meally was a "very good-natured man," Kirkman tells us:

but like many others, who are called good-natured, was apt, on the strength of it, to indulge in violent fits of passion. It happened that this poor girl suffered herself, one morning before the father and mother were up, to be cheated of a few shillings by a party of King William's military officers. When Mr. O'Meally discovered it, he flew into an outrageous passion, stormed at her, and threw her into an agony of fear, which carried her off, after she had lingered under its effects between two and three months.

So Kirkman tells us, but who told Kirkman? I submit that the point is not that Kirkman was romancing, but that he was fitting in as best he could a well-remembered story which his "father" had often enough told him while he was being "bred up, and living for upwards of twenty years with him." One of Macklin's favorite parts for many years was Peachum in *The Beggar's Opera* and he doubtless revelled in Peachum's ironic rages at his daughter Polly for giving herself to Macheath; just so is Luke O'Meally made to rage at "Mary" for failing to collect the standard early morning fees from her customers. What we lose by the suppression of this delightful narrative is, I suspect, an insight into Macklin's own broad humor and gift of gab.

Professor Appleton's tendency throughout the book (for economy's sake, I suppose) is to paraphrase, to abbreviate, to cite, and to refer, at the expense of readability, sometimes of intelligibility, and generally of loss of independence from his sources. When he tells us that "Macklin himself denied a story of Cooke's" concerning the date of his birth (p. 4), but neglects to tell us Cooke's story, we are driven to the library shelves to find it for ourselves. An anecdote from "the elder Macready" about an exchange of rebukes between Macklin and a Dublin audience (p. 8) seemed to me on first reading a little vague in its details; on turning to the indicated source I found that it was really the younger Macready who was doing the reporting—from

hearsay, of course, but at this point not necessarily from his father—and that the story has lost much in transfer to these pages. (Incidentally, the Macreadys are generally scrambled together: in the bibliography and notes W. C. Macready is usually referred to as William, and at least once William is called W. C.) A disastrous shipwreck which destroyed Macklin's library, manuscripts, and other effects (valued at £5000, Cooke tells us) is disposed of in one brief sentence (p. 150). A description of the Smock Alley Theatre, including the statement that "it was much like the English theatre, except for the foyers behind the boxes" (p. 89), sends one reeling among books of reference to find out whether Smock Alley had or had not these "foyers" and what difference they made in any case. Under Fleetwood's management of Drury Lane, "The actors' salaries were in arrears, and on more than one occasion theatrical costumes and properties were abruptly seized" (p. 60): seized by whom? by Fleetwood? by Fleetwood's creditors? by the bailiffs? When George II listened to a reading of Macklin's *Love à la Mode*, we are told, one passage "evidently appealed" to him, he "took offense" at another and "proved sensitive" to a third (p. 120): we are told that the King's manuscript of the play is at the Garrick Club, but not how the author has ascertained the King's reactions. When he tells us that manager Mossop's receipts "often evaporated at the Countess of Brandon's soirées" (p. 132), we are left to wonder whether the Countess operated a bawdy house, a gambling hell, or convocations of pickpockets. Macklin's final quarrel with his daughter Maria is said to have been over the proper reading of a line of Portia's (p. 53); but we must run down the passage in Bernard's *Retrospections* to discover what reading of what line was in dispute. When Maria died of a tumor caused by "buckling her garter too tightly" (p. 203), we wonder (not being familiar with the undergarments of eighteenth century ladies) why she did so, until we find in Kirkman that "she went often into breeches"—i. e., played male parts.

In the handling of specific facts, including dates and statistics, the author's grip is often slippery. His note of acknowledgment to "Mr. Paul Henry Nash of the Enthoven Collection" (p. vi) is probably a slip of the pen for Mr. George Nash. It is misleading to assert that "Irish scholars now concur" on the place of Macklin's birth (p. 5) when the authorities cited are dated 1816, 1895, and 1949. Early in the book we are told that Macklin was a member of the strolling tribe "for almost seventy years" (p. 19); then, as of some sixty-eight

years later, we hear that "after more than fifty years on the stage, Macklin had begun to tire" (p. 218). Did manager Fleetwood propose "revising" three Shakespearian comedies (p. 42), or *reviving* them? When the Macklins went to Ireland in 1748 we are treated to a brief description of Dublin oddly dated 1747 (p. 88). In an account of the production of Macklin's *King Henry VII* reference is made to a magazine report "some years later" (p. 76): the report was fifty-three years later. When Macklin assisted Harris in his court suit against Colman, which was heard in *July of 1770* (pp. 147-8), we are told that "The conclusion of the hearing left Macklin in an uncomfortable position. . . . In consequence, during the 1769-70 season he appeared at Covent Garden only once." When Macklin first appeared as Macbeth the critics compared his performance with Garrick's, "though Macklin had specifically disclaimed any attempt to rival him" (p. 179): the disclaimer was not issued until four days *after* the appearance. When Arthur Murphy published Macklin's two successful plays, we are told that "for thirty years Macklin had zealously guarded them" (p. 230): he had been "guarding" *Love à la Mode* for thirty-four years, *The Man of the World* for only twelve. The matter of the dating of Macklin's first marriage (p. 39) is perhaps a futile pursuit of wild hares. Having decided that the marriage occurred between November 23 and December 8, 1739, when the lady's name changed from Grace to Macklin in the Drury Lane playbills, the author goes on to speculate that "In all likelihood they were married soon after the twenty-eighth of November, for on that date Fleetwood revived . . . *Comus* in which neither had a part." Thus the calendar is cleared for a wedding celebration. The ceremony, however, whenever it took place, was no more than the legalizing of a common-law marriage that had already produced a daughter and had been going on for six or seven years. It could have happened at any odd hour of any day, whether the Macklins were performing at the theatre or not. And so, once more, to bed. As a matter of fact, according to evidence in Sybil Rosenfeld's *Strolling Players*, Mrs. Macklin was calling herself by her husband's name at least three years before this date.

The point of all this niggling, pickish fault-finding, which limitation of space here dictates a halt to, is not to suggest that Professor Appleton is not well-informed in his subject. The trouble is rather that he is *too* well-informed—that from intensive familiarity with his materials and a bland forgetfulness of the needs of us who know less

than he, he fails to tell us all that we ought to be told. A more careful communicator would have given us, incidentally, a chronology, a list of Macklin's roles, and a systematic description of the manuscript resources which have made this restudy of Macklin worthwhile. In consequence of these deficiencies we shall still have to go on reading those old outmoded books which this one ought to have superseded forever. It is a pity, for it is not likely that anyone will undertake the subject again for many years to come.

Except, perhaps, to write the critical summarizing chapter, which Professor Appleton has shirked. Whoever writes a biography of an "old" actor owes to his readers (and to himself) that final essay of evaluation, and he should take for model nothing less than the chapter called "Time and the Artist" which concludes the late Harold Hillebrand's *Edmund Kean*. Only thus can the woods and trees of biographical data be focussed into meaningful composition. It is perhaps true, or should be true, as Professor Appleton somewhere suggests, that the image of Macklin "remains today more alive than that of Garrick," for the scapegoat is always the vividest figure in the story. And Macklin—like the Shylocks, Iagos, Malvolios, and Sir Pertinaxes which he loved to play—was the grand scapegoat, the congenital outsider, the enemy of society who had to be cast out. De Wilde's portrait catches him in the very instant of Sir Pertinax's last exit: "And so, my vengeance light upon you aw together"; and from the same tight-lipped, rock-jawed mouth we seem to hear Malvolio's "I'll be revenged on the whole pack of you." He was impossible to get along with. His first London manager made no bones about telling him he "had better go to grass," and later managers were reluctant to engage him and relieved to see him go (except when he rushed off to his lawyers to sue for breach of contract). For all his fame as Shylock, he was often reduced to Osric, First Witch, Fluellen, and other supporting roles; in a great many seasons he was out of the major theatres altogether while some Garrick or Foote or Barry bore the prize away. But he was contentious to the end. His last recorded comment on Scotchmen, whom he made a career of hating, might also serve for his final judgment of the theatre and the life of his times: "Ah! Damn them!"

University of Illinois

CHARLES H. SHATTUCK



Walter Blair, *Mark Twain and Huck Finn* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1960. xvi + 436 pp. \$7.50). IN this long study Walter Blair attempts "to define the forces which gave *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* its substance and its form" (p. vii). Less interested in the boyhood and piloting experiences contributing to the novel than in their later modifications, he concentrates upon the ten years of Mark Twain's life between 1874 and 1884, the period of the novel's conception and composition. Within this time-context Blair discusses major influences upon *Huckleberry Finn*: Mark Twain's reading and writing, his growing concern with the moral nature of man, his fallible memory, his alteration of past experience for artistic reasons, and many circumstances environing the composition. Blair's book is a foreground matrix study and also a textual study. By patient detection and careful reasoning he has partly revised the time-sequence of composition set up by Bernard DeVoto. This revision was essential to the success of Blair's larger purpose and it increases our understanding of shifting emphases in *Huckleberry Finn* and the process of its origin.

Blair first places Mark Twain in his 1874 Hartford setting. Then after probing the origins of *Old Times on the Mississippi* and *Tom Sawyer*, he relates the themes of these books and some details of content to *Huckleberry Finn*. The writing of *Tom Sawyer*, itself a creative synthesis of Mark Twain's boyhood memories, his reading, and earlier literary rehearsals, is presented as a rehearsal for the writing of its sequel. As he traces the composition of *Huckleberry Finn*, Blair closely ties his shaping forces to successive parts of the novel. Whenever necessary, he discusses literary sources: Carlyle, Dickens, Cervantes, Poe, Goldsmith, Reade, Aldrich, Julia Moore, and many humorists, local color writers, and journalists. He draws parallels between Mark Twain's activities and his fictional effects, and he identifies resuscitated memories entering into the writing. He often skilfully blends all such elements.

This study conveniently records our knowledge of the literary influences upon *Huckleberry Finn*. The discussion of Julia Moore's poetry is particularly engaging, that of William Wright's contribution perhaps the most original. Blair's knowledge of American humor here serves him well, but an unfortunate by-product of this speciality is the grotesque appearance of jarring bits of slang and colloquialisms in the author's otherwise academic prose. A more pioneering contribution is Blair's study of the glancing effects of Mark Twain's



actions, including his business affairs and travels, upon the shifting moods and portrayals of the novel. Frequently, however, the rather simple correlations (hectic Hartford—peaceful Quarry Farm; intrusive shore life—peaceful raft) are insisted upon too heavily. Also this book should stimulate further study of the unity of Mark Twain's writing. Intermittently Blair discusses Clemens' narrative techniques, but in this connection the possible importance of 1601 to *Huckleberry Finn* seems overplayed. He comments on the theme of initiation, or the educational journey, found in several of Mark Twain's books; here the treatment of *The Prince and the Pauper* is particularly helpful.

Blair joins those who believe the informing theme of *Huckleberry Finn* is man's moral dualism, the conflict between the "sound heart" or humane intuition and the conventional conscience. To this theme he rightly attributes much of the novel's greatness. "Huck's coping with the philosophical systems represented by the widow and her sister, his assumptions about the origins of moral principles, his balancing of attitudes inculcated by society against his innate humanity, brought the book to the verge of greatness" (p. 145). Blair shows that Lecky's *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne* helped shape Clemens' expression of his theme, and in Chapter 24 he attempts, with limited success, to assimilate the novel's vast content and the movement of the action to the thematic contrast. In this attempt the interlocking meanings of such concepts as "initiation," "disillusion," and "faith," as they apply directly to Huck or to Huck through his creator, are not clearly resolved.

Blair's study does not significantly extend our understanding of intrinsic meanings in *Huckleberry Finn*. Its admirable historical scholarship reveals many sources of the novel's content. Yet there is unconscious humor, even naivete, in the use of such impressive apparatus to arrive at the conclusion, for example, that Huck gains his poetic sensitivity and tender conscience from his creator, or that Mark Twain's humor—surely ambivalent in its very essence!—was a splendid means of projecting his ambivalent and thus thematic attitude toward saints and sinners both. Blair's method hardly encourages an exploration of the novel's internal relationships so germane to the novel's form. At times it positively encourages fragmented literary judgments, as seen in his assessment of the relatively weak Wilks and circus episodes. *Mark Twain and Huck Finn* has value as a textual

and historical study and also as a reminder that the accumulation of sources cannot replace the insight essential to a genuine synthesis of meaning.

*Miami University*

EDGAR M. BRANCH

**Stephen Crane, *Letters*, ed., R. W. Stallman and Lillian Gilkes (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1960. xxx + 366 pp. \$6.50).** THIS collection of Crane's letters and related materials is as close as the editors could come to a definitive edition, and it will obviously remain the primary source for many years. There is much in this volume that is already familiar to students of the subject, both from the pen of Crane himself and from those of friends and literary associates. Yet some letters one had known only in part are here printed in full. And it is of course useful to have letters by Crane that were previously published in small batches brought together between two covers. Furthermore the editors have published for the first time fifty-six letters and inscriptions by Crane, as well as a number of other letters and autographs. None of these, however, induces us to make any sort of fundamental re-assessment of Crane's life and works.

It used to be the impression that Crane wrote few letters and that those he did write were not very interesting. The labors of Mr. Stallman and Miss Gilkes force us to revise this opinion somewhat, even though one must applaud the candor of Mr. Stallman when he says in the Introduction that "Crane was not a great letter writer." The rather large number of notes to publishers and literary acquaintances on routine business matters are, predictably, of little interest. But some of the letters show the sardonic humor of the author; some of them embark upon brief flights of self-analysis and self-confession; some are momentarily vivid in their portraits of people and places; the few love letters, such as those to Lily Brandon Munroe and Nellie Crouse, have their poignance; some of them allow us to see in rather more detail than was previously possible the early transition Crane made from what he called his "Rudyard Kipling style" to his characteristic realism, a transition made in part under the influence of his literary "fathers," Howells and Hamlin Garland.

But Crane's letters, even when skillfully assembled, do not make a truly rich and substantial collection. Mr. Stallman and Miss Gilkes have done well, therefore, to include a large number of letters from other people—some writing to each other, some to Cora Taylor Crane,

Crane's common-law wife, and some to Crane himself. These letters give us brief glimpses of the doomed and brilliant author of *The Red Badge of Courage* in relation to such correspondents as Henry James, Howells, Conrad, Harold Frederic, Garland, Edward Garnett, and even Theodore Roosevelt, who proclaimed himself much pleased to receive an autographed copy of *George's Mother* but said that he considered *The Red Badge* the best of the author's works. Besides the letters by other people, the editors have included a lengthy Appendix containing miscellaneous reminiscences, essays, comments, and further letters, mostly written after Crane's death (1900) by various publishers, authors, and friends who had known Crane or been impressed by his writings. All this, combined with the editors' copious running commentary and voluminous footnotes, produces something that is really a kind of implied biography rather than a collection of a man's letters. In essence the definitive biography of Crane that no one has written but everyone calls for has been set before us by Mr. Stallman and Miss Gilkes.

Even so, the prospective biographer's task will not be an easy one. Crane is a baffling and elusive character. He was "many-sided," says Mr. Stallman. "He was humble and shy, but he was also arrogant and conceited. He was a gentleman and he was also a smart aleck and an irresponsible heel. On occasion an ornery cuss, he was also lovable." It is tempting to try to unravel these contradictions and complexities and to trace their workings in the ironies of Crane's stories. On the other hand, it is impossible not to be struck by the rightness of Garland's assessment, simplistic as it is: "Crane never quite grew up in any sense. Disease came in to weaken his work and death cut it short. His marvelous command of simple English words is his chief claim to distinction. . . ." But so easy a judgment as Garland's is belied by the psychological content of Crane's fiction, which though it is surely not rich and various, is nevertheless deep and vivid. It began to be so when Crane perceived, as he wrote to Nellie Crouse, that "the fight was not going to be with the world but with myself." The letters do not tell us much about the author's interior wars. But Crane's fight with himself will be the main quarry of the desiderated biographer. He has, after all, been carried a good distance along the way by John Berryman's critical biography. Meanwhile the volume under review, together with Miss Gilkes' recent

Cora Crane (1960), will be of considerable value to whoever finally paints a full portrait of Stephen Crane.

Columbia University

RICHARD CHASE

Lambert C. Porter, *La Fatrasie et le Fatras; essai sur la poésie irrationnelle en France au moyen âge* (Genève: Droz and Paris: Minard, 1960. 275 pp.). THIS is a serious study of a kind of poetry that may be said to range in its essence from the Provençal *devinalh* and Villon's *Ballade des contre vérités* to Lewis Carroll's *Jabberwocky*, and, as Alice said of the latter, "It's rather hard to understand! . . . Somehow it seems to fill my head with ideas—only I don't exactly know what they are!" The *fatrasie* and the *fatras*, in other words, belong to a type of verse that exploits the unreasonable, the ridiculous and the grotesque. Porter shows that both were written in a fixed form, that the *fatrasie* was the earlier of the two, and that it probably originated in the thirteenth century in Picardy or the Artois. His treatment is exhaustive, both the *fatrasie* and the *fatras* are defined, analyzed and defended, and the book includes editions of all examples known to him.

Porter finds that the *fatrasie* always consists of a single stanza of eleven lines rhyming aabaab<sup>6</sup>babab<sup>7</sup> and that the matter is consistently irrational, juxtaposing impossible actors and actions (e.g. a cheese sneezes, a feathered mortar drinks all the foam of the sea, a flying castle sews up an oven, etc.). The purpose of such verse in his opinion was to astonish, mystify and entertain. Because of the willfully illogical confusion of the *fatrasie*, one can easily lose oneself in conjectures, as our author admits (p. 55), but he valiantly attempts none the less to examine the themes, characters and procedures involved, the attitude toward religion, time and death, the use made of contrast, obscenity, violence and the personification of animals and place names.

The *fatras*, which seems to be a slightly later development of the *fatrasie* that arose in the fourteenth century, begins very like it in matter (e.g. an onion brays, a metal calf speaks, a basin chants vigils). But it differs in form; in the *fatras* two lines, often reminiscent of courtly poems, introduce the following eleven, supplying the first and last lines of these and giving them their rhythm which is therefore uniform throughout (AB—AabaabbabaB—only Greban introduces two different meters in the same piece). In the early *fatras* the

eleven lines attached to the initial distich present the same incongruous combinations as those of the *fatrasie*, but with an enhanced piquancy due to the contrast between them and the introductory lines. Cf. for example Watrquet's fourth *fatras* (p. 150):

A bonne amour sui donnee  
Mon vivant pour miex valoir.

A bonne amour sui donnee,  
Quant une chievre damnee  
M'a dit que je doi avoir  
A fame une cheminee . . . etc.

The later *fatras*, however, abandon the nonsense pattern altogether and turn serious; even prayers and other religious pieces were eventually written in the old form. And that form itself developed, taking on a second stanza at times, so that the poems of a transitional author like Baudet Herenc of the fifteenth century bear the incipit: "Cy s'ensuivent *fatras* possibles et impossibles, simples et doubles."

In his desire to rescue these frivolous verses from the denigration of modern critics, Porter occasionally overstates his case. Few would agree that the inventor of the *fatrasie* was "un poète rêveur," that the "désordre de ses idées" is "superbe" (p. 65), that the *fatrasie* sometimes betrays "un effort inconscient pour pénétrer systématiquement dans le domaine de la métaphysique" (p. 105) or that in such poems "la forme fixe devait opposer le maximum de difficultés au génie du poète" (p. 34). Some of the author's generalizations about the origin and development of this genre in relation to the different classes of mediaeval society seem to me to rest on insecure foundations: their authors and audiences, as in the case of most types of mediaeval French literature, can be shown to have belonged to both the higher and lower social strata. Fuller notices concerning the writers of these poems and comparisons of their irrational with their more serious works would have been welcome; so would a glossary instead of a mere index of words.

But one must not ask for too much. The accurate classification of the poems, their editing, localization and chronological arrangement, the discovery of some hitherto unrecognized examples, the collection of mediaeval and later references to them, and the discreet conclusions reached about most of the problems they pose, all constitute a valuable contribution to our knowledge. Since the whole book comprises only two chapters taken from the author's larger study of French irrational

poetry, one eagerly awaits the appearance of the rest of his work in order to learn more about a fascinating subject and the exact position to be assigned in it to the *fatrasie* and *fatras*.

A few observations of minor importance may be added. Page 84. In the *fatras* the use of the second line of the introductory distich as a conclusion seems to me often more cleverly managed than Porter believes. In the example cited here (and p. 158) the humor would be apparent if lines 11 and 12 were repunctuated to read: "Cuers endormis, / L'ombre d'une truie endormie / Amés con fins loiaus amis."—P. 91. The statement that the *fatras* "était, à ses débuts, une poésie de concours" is misleading, especially in view of the more convincing hypothesis (p. 92) that the *fatras* was probably "longtemps une récitation individuelle."—P. 94. Porter concludes, rightly I think, that the *fatras* had no musical accompaniment. To the reasons adduced by him may be added the fact that the directors' copies, the so-called *Abregiés de Mons*, which suggest how Greban's *Mystère de la Passion* was to be performed, do not indicate any musical accompaniment for the six *fatras* found there.—P. 97. Can it be proved that "le roi a préféré le *Fatras* à d'autres formes d'amusement"? Which king? Philippe de France? The rubric printed on p. 149 implies no preference.—P. 105. Porter places the first attempts at writing "la poésie irrégulière" (better: *irrationnelle*) in France no earlier than the thirteenth century. But surely the earliest example of the Provençal *devinalh* written by Guillaume IX (1071-1127) might have been mentioned. Incidentally, one of its lines "[lo vers] Qu'enans fo trobatz en durmen," closely parallels one of the lines in the *Fatrasies d'Arras*, "Je versefie en dormant" (no. 54).

Baltimore, Md.

GRACE FRANK

**Das Nibelungenlied, zweisprachige Ausgabe herausgegeben und übertragen von Helmut de Boor, (Bremen: Carl Schünemann Verlag, 1960. Sammlung Dietrich Bd. 250).** THIS valuable new *Nibelungenlied* translation renders the real meaning of the original work more accurately than any of its predecessors. Simrock and his imitators were generally satisfied with modernizing the spelling of Middle High German terms to that of their modern derivatives, without always allowing for six centuries of semantic change. Words like *êre*, *triuwe*, *zuht*, *stæte*, *tühtic*, *wacker*, *vriundschaft*, etc. were merely



rendered as *Ehre, Treue, Zucht, Stetigkeit, tüchtig, wacker, Freundschaft*, etc., even where the modern word differs essentially from its medieval source. Perhaps convenience in preserving the original rime and meter justified Simrock for retaining the original language despite semantic change, yet that is no reason for English translators to follow his verbally close but conceptually distant translation. Perhaps de Boor's new contribution will lead future English translators to recognize and render the true meaning of the original text.

To avoid being tricked by semantic change, de Boor has avoided using the Middle High German term's modern derivative whenever some non-cognate word is closer to its actual meaning. For example, he renders *vriunde* as *Verwandte, Blutsverwandte, Sippen*, and *Freunde*, depending on the context. On the other hand he sometimes takes the easier path, as for example when he renders *tugent* as *Tugend*, even when the context refers only to physical qualities. De Boor's unusual concern for precise meanings makes a rimed and metrical verse-by-verse translation impossible, and therefore he has contented himself with a strophe-by-strophe version. Although the content of the individual verses is often redistributed, the meaning of the strophes does not suffer, because the strophes of the poem are generally self-contained units and present a single action or a single thought.

De Boor allows himself considerable freedom in matters of vocabulary and grammatical construction. At times he does this for the convenience of the reader, as when a proper noun replaces a confusing pronoun or obscure circumlocution. At other times he does it for the convenience of the rime and meter, as when standing epithets are borrowed from elsewhere in the work. In general he eschews archaisms and tries to make the translation as modern as the original was in its day. Nevertheless he occasionally uses a quaint word such as *Gaul*, which renders *moere*, even though the word *Gaul* now has a pejorative plebian sense unsuited to a knight's horse, even if it be only his pack- or traveling horse. The word *Gaul* is particularly inept for rendering the *ross* of the swift Poles and Walachians (1339, 2). The translator occasionally writes *Herren* in place of *Herrn*, where the meter demands it; and he uses the word *genug* in its Middle High German sense of "very" rather than "adequately," even where the word does not occur in the original text.

A few words seem a bit too modern, as when *Nun het ouch in her Lіндеgast vrientlich erkorn* (184, 1) is rendered as *Jetzt nahm auch*

*der Däne seinen Feind aufs Korn.* To a literalist, this suggests that Liudegast drew a bead on Siegfried with some sort of a fire arm fitted with a front sight. The same holds of the unfortunate word *Bürger* in v. 1057, 1, which today smacks of bourgeoisie, middle class, and citizenship, all of which were beneath the dignity or beyond the comprehension of the *Nibelungen* poet. It is true that he mentions some *burgaere* in v. 1036, 4, but these are noble castle-dwellers, as the epithet *edel* clearly states.

By taking liberties with the wording of his *Urtext* (but not with the overall meaning) de Boor has succeeded in writing excellent verses that closely render the original rhythms and melody. The reviewer only objects to his arbitrary placing of the caesura, which often interrupts normal speech patterns. In numerous verses it falls between the verb and its pronoun subject or object, as is never the case in the original verses.

The translation is preceded by a short introduction, which seems based on de Boor's introduction to his edition of the *Nibelungenlied* and to his account of it in his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*. In briefly discussing the theories of the epic's sources, it follows Andreas Heusler and accepts the "Ältere Not" as a fact rather than a conjecture; and it makes no reference to Friedrich Panzer's views. While slighting the origins, de Boor concentrates on the literary value of the poem itself, which must be appreciated for what it is and not merely as a late and corrupted version of an older and superior heroic tradition. The poet's achievement lies in his skillful blending of the old and the new; the courtly pomp and chivalrous behavior are not extraneous decor but serve symbolic purpose as contrasts to the unbridled forces lurking below the surface. The poem's tragic greatness lies in the fact that its characters realize that all pleasure must turn to sorrow yet still assert themselves heroically in the face of this realization. Although there are undeniable discrepancies between the two halves of the work, literary unity is provided by the personality of the poet and by the total concept of the work.

Although de Boor avoids most controversial points, he does present some matters as dogma which others might consider only conjecture, as in the case of the "Ältere Not." In denying that the poet was a minstrel, de Boor states categorically that he was of knightly birth (*ritterbürtig*). This is possible, yet it is nowhere proved. The poet's concern for genteel manners and noble splendor argue against, rather than for, his noble birth. The stately homes of England and Ireland

are better and more lovingly described in the novels of envious middle-class guests than in those of their occupants; and Walter Scott owed his title to his predilection for noble things, and not vice versa. The unknown poet of the *Nibelungenlied* may have been of noble birth, but it is just as likely that he was a court domestic or official of humble origins who had enjoyed a good clerical training. In general, the most doughty heroes of the world's fiction have been conceived by civilian authors.

De Boor finds inconsistency in Kriemhild's motivation, since she aims to avenge her injured love and also to regain her stolen hoard. Such inconsistency does not fit Kriemhild's basic character. To be sure, the author has conformed to court taste and introduced some love-element into his work, yet in the final catastrophe Kriemhild reverts to the feeling and behavior of her Germanic ancestresses. She is impelled to cleanse her besmirched honor by avenging the two great offenses to her dignity. As a woman, she owes her status to her husband, and as a queen she owes her status to the power afforded by her wealth. By depriving her of these two goods of fortune, Hagen has deprived her of her honor, which she can regain only by punishing him and by regaining her hoard. In other words, she has but a single aim: to restore her honor, even if its costs her life and that of all her kinsmen.

In his introduction de Boor gives a short but excellent explanation of the epic's metrical scheme. The reviewer objects that he treats the work only as a poem, never as a song. He even states that it is a book epic intended to be read (*das zum Lesen bestimmte Buchepos*, p. xxv), whereas it was actually a song written to be sung before social gatherings. The few people who could read in those days preferred to read Latin works, since all literates were Latinists. Despite any secret plebeian literary tastes, scholars claimed to scorn vernacular works as suited only to the *rustici*, a term which included all non-Latinists from peasant to emperor. This fact is indicated by the lack of praise or even mention of vernacular works in their Latin writings.

De Boor may ignore the fact that the *Nibelungenlied* was a song because his own rendition is clearly to be read as a poem. In actuality, a song loses part of its integrity when read as a poem: a song without music is like a peacock without feathers or a nightingale without a voice. De Boor's metric explanation disregards the secondary accent on the last syllable of the four first half-lines. This clearly detracts from the authors' aesthetic intent, as can be seen in the rhythmic

difference in popular German lyrics when spoken and when sung. For example, *Es wár ein Kóenig in Thúle* is rhythmically quite unlike *Es wár ein Kóenig in Thú lè*, and *In éinem kúehlen Grúnde* lacks a certain something heard in *In éinem kúehlen Grún dè*.

Aesop once told of a father and son who could please no one as they journeyed with their ass. People critirized them if the father rode and the son walked, and vice versa. And people criticized if they both walked or if they both rode, or even if they carried the ass. And thus it is with translators. They cannot please reviewers, no matter what they do. This reviewer questions whether it is really advantageous to print the *Urtext* alongside this translation. The translation hardly serves as a key, since it departs from the original wording enough to confuse rather than to help one interpret the original text. Perhaps the general reading public would have benefited more if the *Urtext* had been omitted in favor of a more detailed introduction and considerably more copious notes. Also, the introduction should have been written more for the layman than for the specialist and should not presuppose a familiarity with the subject. Most readers who are already fully familiar with the epic can read it in the original language.

Despite the liberties the translator has taken with the wording, when one finishes reading the translation, he feels that he has just read the original. Greater praise cannot be given to a translation.

Goucher College

GEORGE FENWICK JONES

**Paul Stapf, ed., *Jean Paul und Herder. Der Briefwechsel Jean Pauls und Karolina Richters mit Herder und der Herderschen Familie in den Jahren 1785 bis 1804* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1959. 256 pp.).** THE volume here under discussion contains 164 letters plus the *Denkmal* for Herder which Jean Paul included in *Vorschule der Ästhetik*. The reader who takes up this book expecting to find the correspondence more or less equally divided between the two writers will be disappointed. Whoever reads the subtitle carefully, *Der Briefwechsel Jean Pauls und Karolina Richters mit Herder und der Herderschen Familie*, will not be prepared for the relative paucity of letters from Herder's own hand: only eleven in the entire volume were written by him. Actually the volume might better have been titled *Der Jean Paul-Karolina Herder Briefwechsel*, for there are 76

letters from Karolina to Jean Paul (including six to which Herder added sections) and 44 letters from Jean Paul to Karolina Herder. An additional 26 letters were written by Jean Paul to Herder.

A scholarly edition of the letters of Herder is needed in order to fill one of the great lacunae in the field of German literary sources. The range of his interests and his extensive circle of friends and acquaintances would seem to warrant a definitive edition of his correspondence; but, during the period of over a century and a half that has elapsed since his death, only portions of that correspondence have appeared and many of the letters are to be found only in sources not readily available to scholars. In 1941 (*Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, Vol. XIX, p. 240 and *Goethe, Viermonatsschrift*, Vol. VI, p. 95) and in 1942 (*Paul und Braunes Beiträge*, Vol. LXV, p. 384) a collected edition of Herder's letters was announced under the auspices of the *Herderstiftung* in Weimar with Hans Schauer and Hermann Blumenthal as editors. This reviewer has been unable to find any later information which might indicate that this project is actually being carried out.

The disappointment of this reviewer in the *Jean Paul—Herder Briefwechsel* was due to the fact that Herder's active participation in the correspondence was so limited and is not to be construed as a criticism of Paul Stapf, the editor of the letters. The critical apparatus is excellent: all names and works mentioned in the letters are identified and discussed. In addition, valuable supplementary information has been supplied to aid the reader in seeing the correspondence in proper perspective. To mention only one example, Herder asked Jean Paul to read and comment on the manuscript of his *Metakritik*, which the latter did, sending Herder detailed remarks in letter #30 (November 23, 1798). In the apparatus the editor has given the pertinent passages from the manuscript of the *Metakritik* together with the same passages as they appeared in the first edition of that work. This is very helpful, for a number of the passages on which Jean Paul commented were changed by Herder before the work was published (see pages 169-181 for the editor's comments on Jean Paul's *Metakritik* letter).

The editor lets the letters speak for themselves; he has not attempted to evaluate or interpret the relationship between the two writers in any way. The volume contains neither an introduction nor

an epilogue: the one hundred pages of apparatus are of a purely explanatory nature and should prove of great value to all users of the volume.

The first letters are concerned with attempts of the then unknown Jean Paul to enlist the aid of Herder in getting several of his early essays published. In the course of time a friendship developed between the two men which lasted until Herder's death. Jean Paul was filled with an enthusiastic admiration and love for Herder which never wavered, even when he felt himself neglected by his friend. Herder came to respect Jean Paul's critical acumen and asked for his opinion of such works as *Metakritik* (see above), *Gott* (letters #47, 48), *Kalligone* (letters #80, 81), *Vom Erlöser der Menschen* (letter #16) and *Adrastea* (letter #152). When there was no such favor to ask, Herder tended to neglect the correspondence, and the burden of answering Jean Paul's letters fell on Karolina, who emerges as the mediator between her husband and the author of *Titan*, a work avidly read by the entire Herder family as the parts appeared (see letters #133 and #148).

The fact that Herder wrote so infrequently does not mean that he did not value Jean Paul's friendship. He was often too busy with other matters to write (see letter #123) and in addition he felt that letters were inadequate. A short note dated December 10, 1798 illuminates the whole problem of Herder's participation in the correspondence:

Nicht genug kann ich Ihnen für alles danken, Lieber, Lieber. Für Manuskript, Briefe usw.—Geschriebene Worte sagen nichts; kommt zu uns. Da will ich danken.

Karolina's letters abound in gossip and comments on Weimar activities and personalities from Goethe and Schiller to Kotzebue. For the most part the letters are interesting, but not as important as they might have been, had the majority of the correspondence been written by the two poets themselves.

Northwestern University

LELAND R. PHELPS



Albert Meyer, *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Otto Ludwigs* (Winterthur: Keller Verlag, 1957. v + 188 pp.). OTTO Ludwig's purpose in undertaking the critical and aesthetic studies on Shakespeare and the novel, to which he devoted the last fifteen years of his life almost exclusively, was to attempt to discover by a close analysis of others' works, notably the dramas of Shakespeare and the novels of Scott, Dickens, Eliot, and other English writers of the early nineteenth century, the universal, timeless rules which govern the creation of literary works of art. It was his hope that if he discovered these principles he might be able to realize more easily his own goal, which was to provide for his contemporaries "real" ideals more in keeping with the exigencies of contemporary life than the "ideal" ideals which the writers of the classical and romantic generations had expressed in their works.

As time passed Ludwig realized that the new insights which he had gained might also be of value to other writers, but he was unfortunately too ill in his last years to undertake the arduous task of arranging into a system the hundreds of entries which he had been jotting down from day to day over the years. Knowing the importance which Ludwig attached to his critical writings, his friend Moritz Heydrich prepared the *Shakespearestudien* for publication a few years after the poet's death. His edition, *Otto Ludwigs Nachlassschriften*, Vol. II, Leipzig, 1871-74, is, however, not very useful, for it simply presents the studies in chronological order. Realizing this, Adolf Stern attempted in his edition of Ludwig's collected writings, *Otto Ludwigs Gesammelte Schriften*, 6 vols., Leipzig, 1891, to put the great mass of material into some kind of surveyable order. He also edited the *Romanstudien* (Vol. VI of the *Gesammelte Schriften*), and here, too, he sacrificed chronological order and grouped the studies under topical headings. This arrangement makes for a clearer overall view, to be sure, but in reading the studies in Stern's edition one still has the impression of a series of isolated aphoristic utterances with rather little relationship to one another.

The first critic who has attempted to systematize the contents of the vast corpus of Ludwig's critical writings is the Swiss scholar, Albert Meyer, who has performed the extremely useful service of developing out of them a philosophy of aesthetics. His procedure, as he explains in his introduction, was the reverse of Ludwig's. Where the latter began with detailed analyses of isolated aspects of the various problems of dramatic and epic writing, he proceeded by extracting

from the total corpus of analyses the basic axioms which seem to underly them. Out of these he then developed his later chapters, on Ludwig's idea of poetic realism, on his ethical views, and on his conception of the drama and of the novel. Since Ludwig's theoretical writings were in advance of his practice, Meyer leaves aside all consideration of his creative works as exemplifications of his theoretical views, concentrating exclusively on the critical studies themselves. Nor does he pronounce value judgments. The critical writings are discussed only as an expression of Ludwig's aesthetic outlook, not in terms of their intrinsic value or of their reliability as critical commentaries.

The study, which closes with an interesting discussion of Ludwig's views on lyric poetry and on the role of the poet, is a significant contribution both to Ludwig scholarship and to nineteenth century aesthetics. The reader will find it an excellent guide through the complex, but fascinating maze of Ludwig's critical writings.

*The Johns Hopkins University*

WILLIAM H. McCLAIN

## ***A New Introduction to Greek***

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

*By Alston Hurd Chase and Henry Phillips, Jr.* This new edition of a well-known text will be ready for fall classes. "The number . . . who desire to learn as much Greek as possible in the shortest period of time is increasing . . . The format of the book is delightful. The illustrations . . . are beautiful. The eight appendices are excellent for reference and review purposes. On the whole, this is the best of the text books published up to the moment, if the teacher is permitted to use his discretion as to time."—THELMA B. DEGRAFF, *Classical Weekly*. Illus. About \$4.50

## ***Design and Truth in Autobiography***

*By Roy Pascal.* The author shows that autobiography is a typical and almost exclusive product of Western civilization, and in its greater examples reveals a double concern for the inner self and the outer world. He considers how a life can be reduced to artistic design, and how far autobiography can be truthful; different writers' solutions lead him to evolve a significant analysis by types. \$4.00

## ***Jonathan Swift and the Anatomy of Satire***

*By John M. Bullitt.* "Professor Bullitt's subject is . . . an important one, and his book appreciably advances our knowledge of it. He is aware that Swift's negatives ultimately create a positive . . . and he rightly emphasizes how, in Swift as often elsewhere, Augustan clarity and control do not supplant passion, but refine and intensify it. The distinctive interest of this book, however, is that it exactly identifies many of the instruments whereby Swift obtains his effects."—*The Times Weekly Review* (London) \$4.50

## ***Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy***

*By Jonas A. Barish.* "No glasse renders a mans forme, or likenesse, so true as his speech," Jonson wrote in his *Discoveries*. Seeking for Jonson's "likenesse" in his language, Mr. Barish analyzes his prose for significant patterns. As individual characters' speech patterns are examined in relation to the plays' dramatic totalities, scrutiny of style expands into interpretation of the whole art of Jonsonian comedy. \$6.50

## ***Abraham Cowley's World of Order***

*By Robert B. Hinman.* Abraham Cowley has often been shrugged off by students as a dull minor contemporary of Milton, a poet highly over-rated in his own day. This refreshing new assessment, by analyzing Cowley's poems and his view of his art in relation to 17th-century ideas in science and philosophy, arrives at an opposite conclusion—that Cowley is a poet fascinating in his own right and nearly indispensable as guide and companion into the stimulating new worlds of thought and art which both he and Milton explored. \$6.75

**H**ARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

Princeton

UNIVERSITY  
PRESS

## Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honor

By CURTIS BROWN WATSON

In sixteenth-century Europe and England, certain classical ideas of morality were rediscovered and revitalized. Dr. Watson presents a background study of honor, comparing ancient concepts with the sympathetic restatements of them that appeared during the Renaissance. He then attempts to deepen the understanding of Shakespeare's plays by placing them in this Renaissance history-of-ideas context, pointing up the sharp conflict between Christian morality and the revived pagan humanism.

471 pages. \$7.50

## The Untuning of the Sky

IDEAS OF MUSIC IN ENGLISH POETRY, 1500-1700

By JOHN HOLLANDER

In studying the use of music in English poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Mr. Hollander is concerned with beliefs about music's power and its place in the world-view of the time. Almost all of the English poetry of any musical relevance is concerned, from such major seventeenth-century poems as Crashaw's *Musick's Duell* and Milton's *At a Solemn Musick* to such hitherto almost unregarded poems as Marvell's *Musick's Empire*. "A new and distinctive contribution." — *Northrop Frye*.

482 pages. \$8.50

## Essays on Fielding's Miscellanies:

A COMMENTARY ON VOLUME ONE

By HENRY KNIGHT MILLER

Henry Fielding's *Miscellanies*, three volumes of poetry, essays, and satire written at the central point of his writing career, have not previously been studied in detail. Mr. Miller provides a reference guide to the first volume of three, analyzing the writings and the intellectual traditions in which Fielding worked, Fielding's formal prose style, the rhetoric in his satire, and his relationship to the Greek satirist, Lucian. Fielding's intense moral concerns, his comic genius, and ironic, incisive portraits of man and society—themes in Volume One—are keys to Fielding's intellectual world.

Available in August. 460 pages. \$10.00

Order from your bookstore, or

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, Princeton, New Jersey

